DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 416 987 PS 026 259

TITLE	Creating an Effective National Movement for Interprofessional Education and Training. A Joint Proposal.
INSTITUTION	Washington Univ., Seattle. Human Services Policy Center.
PUB DATE	1996-03-00
NOTE	65p.; Prepared by: Members of the National Network for Interprofessional Education and Training.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Cooperation; *Cooperative Programs; Information Technology; *Interprofessional Relationship; Professional Development; *Professional Education; Professional Training; Program Proposals; *Social Services
IDENTIFIERS	*Family Resource and Support Programs; Information Exchange

ABSTRACT

The Interprofessional Education and Training (IPET) Network recently assessed what is needed to foster a vital nationwide movement to develop interprofessional education and training as part of the normal mode of professional preparation for child and family services. It was decided that the top priority should be to facilitate the exchange of information, ideas, and experience among people involved in professional preparation for this field; although many people and institutions are engaged in professional preparation, too many are having to reinvent old wheels and live through mistakes others have made before them. This proposal presents strategies to achieve this desired exchange of resources. Following a detailed overview of the proposal, contents are: (1) "List of Current National IPET Network Members"; (2) "Forging New Links: The Electronic Component of Enhanced Interprofessional Communication"; (3) "National Academy for Professional Development: Advancing State and Regional Assistance Networks for Collaborative Practice"; (4) "Network Coordination and Conference Development"; and (5) "Proposed Budget." Attachments include "Qualifications and Capacity of Lead Participants" and "The National Professional Development Academy: A Draft of Proposed Goals, Format and Content." (Contains eight references.) (EV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 416 987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

[illegible] EFFECTIVE MECHANISMS FOR INTERPROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

A Joint Proposal

Prepared by:
Members of the National Network
for Interprofessional Education and Training

March, 1996

Richard Brandon

HUMAN SERVICES POLICY CENTER
University of Washington, Box 353060 • Seattle, WA 98195-3060
Phone: (206) 685-3135 • Fax: (206) 616-5769
Web site: http://weber.u.washington.edu/~hspcnews/

PS 026259

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

National Network For Interprofessional Education And Training

Joint Proposal

Contents

Overview of Proposal 1

List of Current National IPET Network Members 15

Sections Providing Detail of Each Project Component

A. **Forging New Links: The Electronic Component of Enhanced Interprofessional Communication** 16

B. National Academy for Professional Development: Advancing State and Regional Technical Assistance Networks for Collaborative Practice 24

C. Network Coordination and Conference Development 36

Proposed Budget 50

References 54

Attachments: 55

1. **Qualifications and Capacity of Lead Participants** 56
2. **The National Professional Development Academy: A Draft of Proposed Goals, Format and Content** 63
3. **Proceedings, National Conference on Interprofessional Education and Training, Los Angeles, March, 1995. Separate Document.**

National Network For Interprofessional Education And Training

Overview Of Proposal

Summary

This is a joint proposal by numerous individuals and organizations who have been working to advance interprofessional education and training around the United States. In the last five years, interprofessional education and training [IPET] has grown from a hopeful notion being developed by a few pioneers, to a vibrant movement with a wide variety of programs and projects spring up all over the country, supported by a variety of private and public funders. Our intent is to amalgamate these diverse activities into an effective national movement. Over the last year, we have forged new partnerships and laid out a road map for the top priorities of funding needs in this field. This joint proposal represents a new commitment to maximize our limited resources by working together instead of competing, and building on existing capacity at numerous institutions.

Our goal is not just to promote a new type of professional training program, but to promote training which encompasses new content necessary to achieve positive outcomes for children, families and communities in increasingly complex social settings. We will therefore also stress the need for universities and service providers to engage in community building through non-hierarchical partnerships which include equitable sharing of power and decision-making. To create an effective national movement, and to ultimately transform the nature of professional training and practice to a collaborative mode, we need multiple modes of communicating what is already known and sharing new experiences and insights as they emerge. The operational components designed to promote communication and mutual learning will include:

- **Internet Communication Among University and Community Participants**
- **An Electronic Clearinghouse for Information On Curriculum, Community Partnerships and Evaluation of Training and Service Projects**
- **A Technical Assistance and Training Network To Draw on the Multitude of Resources Available Around the Country**
- **Regional and National Meetings, Conferences and Published Proceedings**
- **Coordination of the National Network Steering Committee and Linkages to National Professional and Service Associations.**

Children and families are in crisis, with intolerably high rates of child poverty, child abuse and neglect, teen pregnancy, poor educational attainment, substance abuse and emotional distress. The shortcomings of the currently fragmented human service delivery system in meeting these needs are well documented, and efforts are underway all around the nation - and the world - to develop comprehensive, collaborative, community-based services. The primary emphasis in past decades has been on organizational structures necessary to achieve better integrated services. In recent years, it has been recognized that the essential need is for a new type of professional, with a different set of attitudes, knowledge and skills to work in a different way. Many service restructuring efforts have failed because the line practitioners -- teachers, social workers, health professionals -- were not able to interact with each other or with clients in a different way. As long as professionals are trained in a manner which reinforces isolated efforts, all attempts at organizational restructuring will be facing a built in obstacle. A new mode of training, emphasizing collaboration among professionals, and between professionals and communities, holds the promise of reorienting the daily work of the service systems to a different model of "collaborative practice."

Getting professionals to collaborate with each other -- interprofessional collaboration -- is a starting point, but not the final destination. By collaborative practice we mean the process by which now-separate professionals and children, youth and families work together in efforts to improve child, family and community outcomes. Integrating services for children and families is one example of collaborative practice. Other important examples are the provision of both appropriate supports (e.g., mutual aid and assistance networks for parents; legal assistance) and resources (e.g., discretionary income; stipends for program participation). There is growing evidence in support of the ways in which these collaborative practices improve outcomes for children, youth and families (Wang et.al., Schorr,). Finding proven and readily accessible ways to improve these outcomes has become a top priority.

In just the last five years, interprofessional education and training [IPET] has grown from a hopeful notion being developed by a few pioneers, to a vibrant movement with a wide variety of programs and projects spring up all over the country, supported by a variety of private and public funders. Each of these funders has developed a "mini-network" of projects which share information and experiences. Several of these different networks of individuals and institutions promoting IPET have now come together to develop a joint proposal for a National Network. Over the last year we have progressed from a cooperating and competing group of projects pursuing individual interests, to a truly collaborative partnership pursuing a common interest in transforming professional cultures and organizations to provide effective community-based services.

Our objective is to amalgamate the many acts of innovation around the country into an effective national movement. The ultimate aim is a transformation of professional education and training to be built around the principles of collaboration among professionals and between professionals and communities/clients. We have spent the last year mapping the forces affecting professional preparation and designing methods of enlisting them in the process of change. These forces include the faculty and administration of professional schools at universities; the

communities where professionals serve; professional and educational associations, service agencies and funders of service; licensing, accrediting and standard-setting bodies. To be effective, the movement must draw each of these entities into the process of change, modifying their beliefs as well as their policies. This is not so daunting a task as it might sound, since each profession and each service sector already has a strong reform movement under way which is moving it toward collaborative, community based service. We are harnessing the pressure for service reform to generate pressure for reform of education and training. The challenge is to join with the energy of each of these internal movements and help them to be reinforcing across the different sectors. This will require:

- facilitating information sharing among interested parties,
- developing partnerships with ongoing national organizations and local entities,
- offering technical assistance to individuals, communities and institutions wishing to develop IPET programs,
- monitoring the effectiveness of IPET efforts through promoting high quality evaluation.

For the foreseeable future, effective collaborators will be marginalized individuals, maintaining an identity within their home profession and another within the interprofessional world. Until the major professions are transformed to the point where collaboration is the norm, rather than the exception, providing an organizational home for marginalized collaborators through meetings and conferences will be necessary to insure the sense of identity and personal reinforcement required to energize the movement. We have found among our members, individuals and institutions with the capacity to take on these various tasks. We have forged new partnerships and designated task leadership by people who can build on ongoing work and funding to meet the needs of the national network.

Development of the National IPET Network grew out of efforts to plan the second annual National Conference on Interprofessional Education and Training in 1994-95. The several foundations providing support for that conference [Danforth, Stuart, Annie E. Casey, Ewing Marion Kaufman, Hewlett] assisted us in coming together as a group and supported the ongoing coordination and facilitation of the joint development effort. The resulting joint proposal is now being presented to a larger private and public funding community. Our intent is to provide potential funders a map of what we consider the top priority efforts for the national movement over the next few years, seeking new partnerships to achieve our common objectives while minimizing competition for and fragmentation of limited funding resources. After receiving feedback from the funders group, we will invite them to invest in this joint effort.

Core Values and Principles for Interprofessional Education and Practice

There are several core principles which have guided our efforts to design a strategy which will produce a successful national movement.

- We must remain focused on the ultimate outcomes for children and families, not substituting collaboration for its own sake as our goal. A clear specification of competencies for practitioners to achieve positive outcomes is necessary. We would like programs and

policies for children and families to be as universal as possible, without losing a primary emphasis on serving the disadvantaged.

- We are moving toward a new concept of professionalism, based upon different competencies and non-hierarchical relationships with consumers, communities and each other. We will model this in the Network's collaborative partnership model and in our hiring practices, recruiting staff with community-based experience rather than just academic credentials.

- To produce and sustain this new mode of professionalism, we must create a new structure of institutions and their relationships, and train practitioners to promote change in education and training institutions as well as in service institutions.

- We seek an enlarging and inclusive network of individuals and institutions. We will continue to function as a network of existing entities, rather than consuming resources by creating a large new organization. Our success will be measured by whether we can attract large numbers of adherents, serve them well and transform other national organizations, rather than by whether we grow in staff and funding.

- We must create an appropriate role and methodology for evaluation and feedback which includes ethnographic methods of incorporating the cultural context of programs and involves community partners in defining, measuring and reviewing achievement of objectives.

The following list of specific principles helps define the direction and parameters for the new models of practice, education and training which we see emerging:

Overarching Values and Principles

- Equity, inclusion and access for all participants
- Community based partnerships for both service and training
- Emphasis on early intervention and prevention in service and training
- Strength-oriented and holistic approaches to service should be adopted
- Resources and services should be based on individual, family and community strengths and tailored to their needs
- Families should be seen as experts and partners in decision-making
- Each profession has important contributions to make and should be respected equally
- Specific, long-term goals and short-term, measurable outcomes must be established
- Enfranchising and liberating approaches to families and communities are necessary
- Policy advocacy should be included as a core element of preparing human service professionals.

The Content of Collaborative Practice Services

- Practice should be child centered and family focused
- The context of site issues must be considered
- Skills for family/client/professional collaboration must be developed
- Culturally responsive services are required
- Ethical issues in collaborative practice must be considered
- A community development orientation must infuse human services.

The Process of Learning and Inquiry

- The use of case study methodology is encouraged
- A focus on problem solving methodology is necessary
- Participation in site-based activities by students and faculty is a necessary component
- Real-life community problem solving should be included in IPET curricula
- Partnerships between community-based organizations, non-profit organizations and university should be expanded, with all players on an equal footing
- Mutual learning among community persons, practitioners, faculty and students should be the norm
- Cross-discipline supervision of all students should be allowed and encouraged
- Participatory action-research methodologies and other reflective practices should be adopted
- Developmental research methodologies should be encouraged.

Road map For An Integrated Strategy

Over the last year, the IPET Network Steering Committee surveyed the landscape and assessed what is needed to foster a vital nation-wide movement to develop interprofessional education and training as part of the normal mode of professional preparation. We decided that the top priority is to facilitate the exchange of information, ideas and experience among people involved in professional preparation. Many people and institutions are engaged, but too many are having to reinvent old wheels and live through mistakes others have made before them. Forging an effective national movement requires regular communication among participants in multiple formats.

If interprofessional collaboration is to contribute meaningfully to school reform, to integrated community health and mental health services, and to consumer-centered family social work practice, we must construct and sustain viable interprofessional networks. This means seeking viable access points and encouraging utilization to develop and promote a broader knowledge base than the individual professions' traditions allow. University faculty who prepare these professionals have expressed and demonstrated keen interest in talking to each other, and

across their disciplines, to change the way practitioners are educated and trained, and to renew their vision of the potential for collaboration in practice.

It became clear from our discussions that many different forms of communication are necessary to achieve this goal. Electronic Internet connection is the most expeditious venue for current and potential IPET participants to rapidly draw down the full range of curricula, program designs and evaluations available. Similarly, electronic mail is an expeditious way of allowing individuals around the country to draw upon each others' ideas and experiences. However, more extended face-to-face communication is necessary both to inspire new entrants who want to create IPET programs and to allow current participants who are already operating such programs to exchange ideas and experiences in depth. For institutions and communities seeking to start new IPET programs, an ongoing technical assistance and training relationship with someone able to spend a significant amount of time at their location is necessary in addition to electronic access to materials developed elsewhere around the country. We have therefore developed an integrated strategy to facilitate these different forms of communication, which will be described below. We have assigned various network members who already have a base of expertise and funding in one of these areas to take the operational lead. In additional to building on existing capacity, working together over the last year has allowed us to create many new partnerships, so that additional organizations have joined with those previously working on one or another component of the project. We have also been able to work out close linkages among the components, so that they will be mutually reinforcing parts of a coherent strategy.

The operational components of the effort will include:

- Internet Communication Among University and Community Members
- An Electronic Clearinghouse for Information On Curriculum, Community Partnerships and Evaluation of Training and Service Projects
- A Technical Assistance and Training Network To Draw on the Multitude of Resources Available Around the Country
- Regional and National Meetings, Conferences and Published Proceedings
- Coordination of the National Network Steering Committee and Linkages to National Professional and Service Associations.

The following sections set forth how we will achieve our major objective of producing a new generation of professionals competent to deliver outcome-driven, collaborative, comprehensive, community-based services. Together, these chapters will map out a plan for stimulating innovative efforts around the country, capturing the learning from these efforts and communicating them widely among interested individuals and organizations. Each proposed component of the network will explicitly address its linkages with the others, so that a mutually reinforcing set of communications occurs, including electronic linkages, face to face interaction at local settings and in national conferences and printed materials.

Proposal Highlights

In this section we will provide a brief summary and rationale for the major components of the joint proposal; more detailed information will be provided in the sections which follow.

Electronic Communication

Objectives:

1. Provide current and prospective IPET participants in universities, community groups and service agencies with access to a data base of current knowledge of program curriculum and content, relevant publications and evaluation results.

2. Facilitate rapid exchange of information and ideas among current and potential IPET participants through email, bulletin boards and other methods. Participants will include line practitioners, university faculty and staff and students, community organization and families being served.

3. Assure that all participants have access to electronic communications, especially to assure that community as well as university participants are included in the conversation and information exchanges from early stages.

Operational Response:

- **Forging New Links: An electronic clearinghouse and network, with technical assistance and training for community based organizations.**

The National Center for Social Work and Education Collaboration at Fordham University has already received funding [Readers' Digest/DeWitt Wallace] to create an electronic network to link its ten projects and provide them an electronic clearinghouse of information on curriculum and related matters. We have experimented with electronic communication during our development period. Much steering committee communication already occurs over the Internet. Network members are already referring new contacts to NCSWEC for connection, and we have been passing on conference and meeting notices, bibliographies and other requests for information. NCSWEC will operate the electronic clearing house for the National IPET Network, providing us an easy form of communication and a repository for critical information. A high level national advisory board will be created, including steering committee members, to assure that the emerging needs of the national movement are taken into account.

Building on the base created by NCSWEC, the expanded electronic network -- called Forging New Links -- will:

- Collect and disseminate information on collaborative efforts nationwide relevant to the interdisciplinary professional preparation of school and agency practitioners through a comprehensive, on-line database. The database would include relevant curricula, project

evaluations, program descriptions, bibliographies, directories, abstracts of relevant journal and popular articles, and pointers to other databases.

- Promote awareness of the database so that it can serve as a central archival resource--available electronically--on interprofessional collaboration. Promote use of Internet resources and tools to assure that participants enjoy easy and wide access to information.

- Conduct a national survey of institutions that prepare teachers, social workers, health professionals, public administrators and other helping professions, to assess the measures most needed to engage new communications technologies in training and practice.

- Develop a strong nucleus of electronic communications users at selected sites by conducting on-site training and ongoing technical assistance, and providing incentives based on facility of access to resources. Promote on-line computer access as a budgetary priority to routinize electronic communications.

- Provide training materials and technical assistance to college/university teacher preparation, nursing, allied health, social work, public health, public administration, and other professional training programs, and to their public school and community agency partners, so they may take advantage of emerging communications

- Study and report on public school-linked/community agency on-line communications efforts that would serve as models to engage student teachers, social work interns, teachers, social workers, counselors, health professionals and administrators in critical issues in school reform collaboration.

- Establish links between local school/agency/community participants seeking electronic access, and regional/local efforts, discovered through national networks, to increase access (e.g., Computers for Social Change, Smart Valley). Develop ties to networks like the National Center for Service Integration and HandsNet.

Technical Assistance and Training Network;

Objectives:

1. Develop and disseminate a new model for interprofessional education and practice in which consumers act as partners, co-authors and paraprofessional educators and service providers and to build cross-systems partnerships in support of this model.

2. Assure that there are sufficient numbers of consumer-accountable IPET programs in each state and region of the country to have a significant impact on the overall nature of human service professional preparation. A National Staff Development Academy will train lead trainers in each state and region, who will then train others to create a self-sustaining chain. State and regional trainers will be able to respond to ongoing requests and maintain long-term relationships with projects.

3. Enhance the quality of new and developing IPET programs by assuring that they are provided a basis of experience from past efforts around the country, and assisted in incorporating that experience into their designs. Utilize impact teams to continuously document relevant barriers, lessons learned, results and data-based change strategies.

4. Develop a national network of individuals and institutions (at universities, non-profits and community based organizations) with the relevant expertise to assist new and developing IPET efforts; facilitate access to the network of experts by those seeking assistance.

Operational Response:

- **Advancing State and Regional Technical Assistance Networks for Collaborative Practice, through a National Staff Development Academy to train facilitators and grants to regional and state teams comprised of professionals, community leaders and consumers of services.**

Katherine Hooper-Briar and Hal Lawson at Miami University of Ohio have been providing technical assistance to a variety of community and university projects around the country with funding from the Danforth Foundation and the US-HHS Child Welfare Bureau. These efforts have made it clear that there is a tremendous demand to have such assistance available, and that the best form of assistance is from individuals in the area who can maintain ongoing relationships with the local effort. Lawson and Hooper-Briar will therefore be responsible for developing a network of competent individuals around the country and provide them funding to offer technical assistance in establishing IPET programs. This will be phased in over time, with staff and resources growing to provide national coverage.

- A new National Academy for Staff Development will be created, and charged with developing and disseminating the curriculum, syllabi and background materials for training lead trainers in the new model of consumer-accountable interprofessional education and practice. The Academy will draw upon the work of leading national institutions and individuals for content, and have an advisory board composed of members of the National IPET Steering Committee.

- The National Academy for Staff Development will issue RFPs and select individuals and institutions around the country to serve as Regional TA Teams. Each Regional TA Team will receive a minimum of four days of training and staff development at the Academy and at least two days of on site technical assistance.

- Groups selected to serve as Regional TA/training Teams will have institutional backing from either universities or community-based institutions which have ongoing links to efforts for institutional change. These capacity-builders will form a cadre of lead trainers, charged with using local networks to train others to train practitioners in consumer-accountable interprofessional practice.

- Regional TA Teams will conduct an inventory of existing relevant networks and develop multi-year plans with goals, benchmarks and methods to chart progress and outcomes toward developing capacity for new model of service. Teams will each receive $50,000 for two years to support their local, sate and regional capacity building, cross network collaboration, pilots and training. Each will receive an additional $10,000 for impact teams to document their work.

- Trainers will have to show that they have assembled an interprofessional team with the requisite skills, knowledge and resources to provide high quality assistance. The network organizers will be responsible for quality control, assuring that trainers have actual competence, not just paper credentials, and that trainers follow through on their commitments to universities and communities.

- TA network resources will be devoted to capturing the content of local discussions, including the questions raised and issues confronted, in order to feed them back into national conference planning efforts and to the electronic clearinghouse.

- The TA network will draw upon and contribute to national literature and information in the national electronic clearinghouse. Mid-level operations will be organized at the state level, recognizing the critical contextual role of state policies for children and families in effective training. Local and regional trainers will be identified and listed on the electronic clearinghouse. A national data base of minority professionals will be maintained within the electronic clearinghouse and be offered as part of the package of resources.

National Meetings, Conferences and Proceedings

Objectives:

1. Recruit and retain a highly informed and energized cadre of individuals and institutions who are engaged in promoting interprofessional education and training as a major part of their ongoing activity in both universities and communities.

2. Provide an organizational locus for face-to-face information exchange among current and potential IPET participants.

3. Facilitate in-depth discussion of experiences and challenges among IPET participants. Provide exposure to key IPET concepts, designs and inspiration to new or potential participants.

4. Assure significant discussion of interprofessional issues at regular meetings of national professional societies and service associations.

5. Assure that networks of community-based organizations and individuals are included in the national discussion, and utilize their energy and creativity as catalysts for change in large institutions.

6. Engage the active participation of local community leadership and emerging youth leadership in interprofessional education and practice.

7. Capture the ideas and information exchanged at meetings/conferences and return it to the field in useful summaries and proceedings.

Operational Response:

- **Joint planning, convening and publishing proceedings of regional meetings, national conferences and inclusion in professional and community association meetings.**

A group composed of UW/HSPC, CSU/CCC and USC/Social Work has received funding for two national invitational conferences on interprofessional education and training in 1991 and 1995. UW/HSPC has recently published extensive proceedings from the most recent conference. HSPC, CSU and USC will continue to organize national conferences, expanding them to be large annual events, and drawing upon an expanded planning group which includes the Interprofessional Commission of Ohio and the National Commission on Leadership in Interprofessional Education.

- The Interprofessional Commission of Ohio, which has been coordinating the National Consortium on Interprofessional Education and Practice will share in funding from the group, with a particular function of facilitating relationships with national professional associations. We will both attempt to have IPET sessions added to national professional associations

meetings and to have national associations participate in IPET conferences as active cosponsors.

- Yolande Trevino of Vaughan Family Center will be funded to join the group with the specific function of developing linkages between IPET network conferences and community based organizations and facilitating the participation of local community and emerging youth leadership in interprofessional education and practice.

- We will actively promote conferences, seeking to enlarge the reach of the network. Staff will track conferences of various other professional and community organizations and actively promote interprofessional presentations.

- The network will sponsor annual conferences, which will have two tracks. One track will provide exposure about key concepts and ongoing efforts to new and potential participants in IPET activities. A second track will allow experienced IPET participants to engage in deeper discussions of emerging knowledge and issues in the field. Both tracks will include commissioning high quality papers and facilitating the presentation of emerging results from evaluations of both service and training projects around the country. Participants and presenters will be encouraged attend in interdisciplinary teams.

- We will include funding to pay for community representatives, youth leaders and professional students to attend steering committee meetings and conferences.

- UW/HSPC will continue to prepare conference proceedings and disseminate them nationally in both written and digital form.

National Network Steering Committee Coordination

Objectives:

1. Facilitate the continued development of the national network and its steering committee as a collaborative enterprise, through periodic group meetings, written interchange and coordination of staff located at different institutions.

2. Assure that all members of the network and steering committee have access to timely information about activities of member networks and relevant professional society and service association efforts.

3. Capture the creative discussions among members and feed them back in a timely manner through minutes and other publications.

4. Keep in touch with other related and emerging networks and facilitate joint efforts with the National IPET Network.

Operational Response:

- **Ongoing coordination and facilitation of the National Network, convening of steering committee meetings and monitoring of the network's achievements and challenges.**

UW/HSPC has been coordinating the activities of the steering committee, including securing funding, arranging and facilitating meetings, preparing timely summaries of steering committee decisions and discussions and keeping members informed of activities. HSPC will continue to perform these functions, and will build on existing organizational capacity to expand these activities in several ways.

The movement will require a recognized hub, not to control the multiplicity of efforts, but to assure that all members are kept informed and to stimulate growth of the network. We place high value on collaboration among equal partners from universities, service agencies and communities services, and have built new partnerships into all our proposals. We will continue to operate as a network, rather than creating a new organization.

- The movement will be held together in the operational phase by coordinating a staff group across the different operating entities, and involving that staff group in steering committee meetings so that they develop identity and allegiance to the Network as well as to the group by whom they are directly employed.

- HSPC will invest substantial leadership time from the Director, and hire full time staff to meet the needs of an expanding national effort. Staff will track activities of network members and related organizations around the country, and distribute written and electronic materials which keep members informed of developments. A key function will be to gather information from the electronic clearinghouse requests and discussions, and from the TA/training activities to inform the steering committee and conference planning group about issues of interest and interesting innovations and experiments.

- The steering committee coordination effort will include maintaining ties with current and potential funders to assure that the financial needs of a growing national effort can be met.

Key Linkages Among Operational Components:

The components described above have been designed over the past year to be mutually reinforcing, with specific linkages among them. For example, any individual or institution reached by the technical assistance and training effort will be made aware of the electronic clearinghouse and added to the national conference invitation list. Similarly, all national conference attendees will be given information about the electronic clearinghouse and the TA/Training network. To close the loop, anyone contacting the electronic clearinghouse for information will also be made aware of the TA/Training network and the national conferences.

Work in Progress

The group which has met for the last year has achieved a tremendous amount, as reflected in this joint proposal. However, as we have met, we have identified additional critical issues which we are in the process of addressing, but are not yet prepared to present firm proposals. These include:

- *Equity Issues.* A concept paper on plans to address equity issues in addition to those addressed within the initial operational proposals is being prepared. It will consider such items as a strategy for improving the recruitment of minority community members into professional schools, and methods to meet the financial family and personal challenges they face in completing their studies. We will explore the opportunity to build on the competencies of community workers and focus on equity of outcomes [the working group includes Block from Wheelock, Shimabukuro from Mutual Partnerships Coalition and Trevino from the Vaughan Family Center.

- *Evaluation.* We will touch base with organizers of the several ongoing efforts to develop national evaluation plans and see they are interested in joining forces with each other and linking their efforts to the National Network for IPET.

- *Public Policy Aspects of IPET.* We are circulating via the Network's electronic clearinghouse operated by NCSWEC a brief piece by Sid Gardner framing the issue. Mike Casto will facilitate network outreach and response to the framing piece. Trevino and Corrigan will solicit community input to the policy framing piece. After judging the response, we will consider developing a further proposal.

- *Accreditation, Licensing and Certification Issues.* A framing paper will be produced laying out the relevant roles, issues, opportunities and challenges to improving collaborative, community based practice by undertaking to work with national professional societies and accrediting bodies to revise accreditation guidelines, or with state bodies to revise licensing and certification requirements. The group will review the framing piece and decide whether to take on the an initiative.

Budget Summary:

	Year 1	Years 1-3
Electronic Clearinghouse and Network	*202,000*	*546,000*
Technical Assistance and Training	*441,000*	*1,332,000*
National Meetings and Conferences and Ongoing Coordination of National IPET Network Activities	*388,000*	*1,206,000*
Total	*1,031,000*	*3,084,000*

Network of Networks, Current Membership

Tania Alameda, Healthy Learners, Miami
Rick Brandon, Human Services Policy Center, University of Washington
Joni Block, Wheelock College
Michael Casto, Interprofessional Commission of Ohio; National Consortium on Interprofessional Education and Practice
John Clinton, Fordham University, National Center for Social Work and Education Collaboration
Dean Corrigan, Commission on Leadership in Interprofessional Education
Carolyn Denham, Fordham University, National Center for Social Work and Education Collaboration
Sid Gardner, CSU Fullerton, Center for Collaboration for Children
Kim Gibert, Bloom Middle School, Cincinnati, Ohio
Katherine Hooper-Briar, Miami University, Ohio
Jeanne Jehl, US Dept. of Education
Hal Lawson, Miami University, Ohio
Jacquelyn McCroskey, USC School of Social Work
Craig Shimabukuro; Mutual Partnerships Coalition, Seattle
Yolande Trevino, Vaughan Street Center, Los Angeles

Funders Participating in National Network:

Ray Bachetti, Hewlett Foundation
Barbara Haar, Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation
Amy Loomis, Stuart Foundations
Rick Love, Knight Foundation
Janice Nittoli, Annie E. Casey Foundation
Margo Quiriconi, Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation
Bonnie Strickland, MCH Bureau, DHHS
Peter Wilson, Danforth Foundation

Forging New Links:
The Electronic Component Of Enhanced Interprofessional Communication

Summary of Electronic Communications Component

The first strand of our integrated communications strategy is a broad effort that will employ new and emerging electronic communications technologies. This initiative will promote, establish and maintain effective connections among school and community agency personnel, university faculty and staff in the fields of education and health and human services, candidate professionals in these fields, government agency staff and other interested parties.

The overall approach is to:

1. Establish a national electronic communications network to advance interdisciplinary collaboration in education and health and human services.

2. Use this network to link to each other and to needed resources --

- **school teachers, principals, social workers, nurses, public health practitioners, public agency administrators**
- **university faculty and candidate professionals in these disciplines**
- **community organizations.**

3. Assist those without access to electronic communications to acquire access. In particular, we will develop strategies and build alliances to provide access for the families all these professionals and organizations are intended to serve; our goal is to ensure that the (often) "missing voices" of families are heard.

4. It will be necessary to devise and promote equitable and viable fee structures -- including a sliding scale -- for products and services to allow this effort to become self-sustaining. A key objective of this effort will be to assure that these resources are available at minimum viable costs, universally accessible, thematically focused, and widely known and used.

We recognize that schools and agencies cannot go their separate ways in contending with complex, inter-related social problems while attempting, in isolation, to improve academic achievement, community well-being, and the life chances of individuals. Therefore, we hope to widely disseminate current learning about change efforts that engage professionals and consumers in a collaborative process that is informed by community participation. We believe we can significantly enhance the effort to foster interprofessional education and training -- and advance community participation in educational institutions and health and human services organizations -- if we employ the powerful technological tools that are now at hand, but are still under-utilized in the preparation and practice of the "helping professions."

Engaging diverse professionals in an ongoing conversation presents challenges; but we recognize that far greater difficulty resides in providing disenfranchised community members the technology, training, time, and a suitable venue, to participate meaningfully in the development of community-generated professional preparation programs. We do not as yet know the best solution to this dilemma, but we suggest below an effort that will at least sensitize professionals to the critical issues, and may provide a basis for developing strategies.

In this dynamic domain, many ongoing developments in commercial, government, and academic policy spheres are daily changing the landscape of access issues and prospects. For example, according to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), *1995 Survey of Advanced Telecommunications in US Public Schools, K-12*, half of the public schools in the US have access to the Internet through at least one computer, an increase from 35 percent of public schools in 1994, and 9 percent of public school "classrooms" have Internet access (3 percent did in 1993). But only 31 percent of schools with large proportions of students from poor families (71 percent or higher eligibility for free or reduced-price lunches) have access to the Internet, compared to 62 percent of schools with relatively few students from poor families (less than 11 percent eligibility). More than half of all schools cite "funding" as the top barrier to using computers and on-line resources as teaching tools, according to the survey.

Defining The Need for Electronic Communications

For Current Professionals

If interprofessional collaboration is to contribute meaningfully to school reform, to integrated community health and mental health services, and to consumer-centered family social work practice, we must construct and sustain viable interprofessional networks. This means seeking viable access points and encouraging utilization to develop and promote a broader knowledge base than the individual professions' traditions allow. University faculty who prepare these professionals have expressed and demonstrated keen interest in talking to each other, and across their disciplines, to change the way practitioners are educated and trained, and to renew their vision of the potential for collaboration in practice.

Emerging electronic communications technologies can provide a powerful tool to engage professionals and promote this level of communication. And this technology can--given appropriately supportive public policy--expand participation to community-based organizations. But despite the potential, many obstacles stand in the way of using networked computers as a communications medium in the preparation of professionals to practice in the community.

Notwithstanding wide enthusiasm about the promise of the "information superhighway," practitioners and faculty in the human services professions are, by and large, latecomers to networked-communications technology (Harasim, Hiltz, Teles, Turoff, 1995). Many lack easy access to computers and may be, therefore, computer-averse. A widely-held view, we have found, is that technology requires extensive training and brings with it frustration and distraction,

a condition aggravated by limited access to electronic networks, and confusion about computer interfaces to the Internet.

In addition to such obstacles, collaboration across disciplines often carries the baggage of strained communication with persons who speak a different professional language. We have found these conditions to be widespread, based on workshops and meetings conducted among faculty representatives of the ten universities that constitute National Center sites, and from an informal survey of other institutions, as well as from on-line discussions in higher education forums and the literature on instructional technology. Coupled with an as-yet evolving system of access to resources on the Internet, these obstacles impede effective use of the most powerful technology-tool for collaboration: the interactive--potentially collaborative--medium of computer networks.

For Future Professionals

Survey data from multiple sources periodically reported in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and elsewhere suggest that graduate students in "helping professions" programs are increasingly likely to be familiar with computers. However, student access at universities diminishes as demand increases, and more and more universities charge students fees for computer and communications access. For effective collaboration, graduate students need to go beyond "computer literacy," and to fully integrate effective electronic communication in their professional practice--with peers, with students in related disciplines, and with their academic mentors. As well, access to broad but focused information resources is essential. As a US Department of Health and Human Services report disclosed (US DHHS. January 1991. Service integration: A twenty-year retrospective.), one of the six fundamental barriers to service integration efforts across program areas is lack of knowledge about what works.

For Schools and Communities

The public school setting--the largest common ground experience for children and families--holds out the promise of a partial solution to the problem of access, but as yet school-site access is no more than a promise. While computers have emerged as a worthwhile instructional tool, schools do not widely equip teachers with desktop computers to do their job, computer labs are often outmoded, and, according to a US Department of Commerce panel, less than 15% of the nation's classrooms had (in 1994) a telephone line to connect a computer with an on-line system.

An essential feature of a collaborative, full-service approach is to begin to include the absent voices of community in developing interprofessional education and training. Yet community-based organizations are generally least able to achieve access to the new technologies. This project will attempt to begin to change that.

The Proposed Solution

Collaborative projects have tended to be small, externally funded, and not sustained once funding ends. Therefore, vigorous promotion of an electronic communications network is needed to sustain the momentum of collaborative training and to foster ongoing interaction between school-site collaborative training and university preparation programs. Technology, we recognize, is not a panacea. But, after a relatively modest initial investment, technology offers a prospect for fast, interactive, ongoing, inexpensive (per-unit), distance-spanning and boundary-crossing collaboration.

In small pockets throughout the nation, community-centered technology projects connect people to the power of interactive communication. While technology alone cannot resolve social, health, and educational problems, the power of technological tools in the hands of community members may begin to help level the playing field among families, communities, professionals and university faculty.

We propose to support a larger network of participants that is striving to foster a national dialog on what is needed and what works within the emerging movement toward integrated social services and interdisciplinary training of school-linked professionals, and to create the framework and the systems for implementing effective information exchange. This effort will draw together enhanced communication among professionals and academics, and facilitating the entry of community and family representatives into the emerging electronic conversation.

Electronic Communication Objectives:

1. Provide current and prospective IPET participants in universities, community groups and service agencies with access to a data base of current knowledge of program curriculum and content, relevant publications and evaluation results.

2. Facilitate rapid exchange of information and ideas among current and potential IPET participants through email, bulletin boards and other methods. Participants will include line practitioners; university faculty, staff and students; community organizations and families being served.

3. Assure that all participants have access to electronic communications, especially to assure that community as well as university participants are included in the conversation and information exchanges from early stages.

Operational Response:

- **Forging New Links -- An electronic clearinghouse and network, with technical assistance and training for community based organizations.**

Current Status of Electronic Information Network

The National IPET Steering Committee has designated NCSWEC to operate the network's electronic communications network, asking it to expand its existing system for more general usage. NCSWEC has already created an Internet "gopher site" using Fordham University's Internet node. This mechanism permits free and unrestricted access to information on the universities that constitute the National Center for Social Work and Education Collaboration sites. Available information includes: university-level course descriptions and broad curricula, school-site programs, program-evaluation reports, bibliographies, seminars, scholarly papers, program descriptions, conferences, regional surveys, and program evaluations. The "gopher" arrangement facilitates access to electronic file transfers, e-mail, and electronic versions of newsletters in the area of interprofessional education and training evaluation.

A master mailing list of the electronic mail addresses of 250 persons engaged in collaborative services activities has been compiled from a variety of sources. Persons on this list participate in an electronic listserve group -- an electronic bulletin board to which any subscriber can post a query, a response to a question, a conference announcement, a request for proposals, or other information of interest to subscribers.

Description of Objectives and Operational Responses

Objective 1. Provide current and prospective IPET participants in universities, community groups and service agencies with access to a data base of current knowledge of program curriculum and content, relevant publications and evaluation results.

Operational Responses:

- Create a comprehensive, on-line database on nationwide collaborative efforts relevant to the interdisciplinary professional preparation of school and agency practitioners. The database would comprise relevant curricula, project evaluations, program descriptions, bibliographies, directories, abstracts of relevant journal and popular articles, and pointers to other databases.

- Promote awareness of the database so that it can serve as a central archival resource -- available electronically -- on interprofessional collaboration.

- Promote awareness of, and access to Internet resources and tools to assure that programs have easy and wide access to information that may facilitate collaborative training and program development.

- Hire staff needed to: collect and include information from all identified collaborative service and training sites; review, format, and post this information on the Internet; promulgate standards for collection and dissemination of information; maintain listserv functions; provide technical assistance on the use of technology tools for information access; create pointers to

other information resources; seek out appropriate information sources, and maintain information updates.

- Expand the current Interprofessional Education & Training gopher offerings to include program evaluation reports, unpublished faculty and student papers, and related information from additional universities. Establish procedures to maintain information updates.

- Gather wide-ranging information on publications, conferences, and training and disseminate via the main listserv; maintain listserv discussion threads; foster information exchanges.

Objective 2. Facilitate rapid exchange of information and ideas among current and potential IPET participants through email, bulletin boards and other methods. Participants will include line practitioners, university faculty and staff and students, community organization and families being served.

Operational Responses

- Plan and take steps to implement new on-line information systems: assess computer hardware, software, and telecommunications consulting needed to advance the project Establish, administer, and promote the use of an electronic bulletin board for cross-disciplinary exchange as a medium well-suited to collaborative efforts.

- Study and report on public school-linked/community agency on-line communications efforts that would serve as models to engage student teachers, social work interns, teachers, social workers, counselors, health professionals and administrators in critical issues in "full-service school" reform collaboration.

- Investigate the potential of new computer-based communications tools that may foster effective parental involvement in school reform, such as family-school, family-agency, and family-university electronic bulletin boards.

- Develop stronger ties to resources and other networks, such as the National Center for Service Integration, the National Center for Children in Poverty, the Harvard Family Resource Project, the Family Resource Coalition, and electronic networks like HandsNet.

- Foster interdisciplinary communication and public school-agency-university communication using new and emerging technologies so that site-based reform efforts are informed by a broad professional perspective on the relevant systemic issues.

Objective 3. Assure that all participants have access to electronic communications, especially to assure that community as well as university participants are included in the conversation and information exchanges from early stages.

Operational Response

- Conduct a national survey of institutions that prepare teachers, social workers, and other helping professions to assess the measures most needed to engage new communications technologies in these professions' training and practice.

- Develop a strong nucleus of electronic communications users by conducting on-site training and ongoing technical assistance at universities, drawing from the emerging network of institutions identified by the national interprofessional education and training network, and provide incentives based on facility of access to resources.

- Promote on-line computer access as a budgetary priority in the relevant organizations in order to routinize electronic communications. Identify associated critical issues, document process, and produce targeted training materials.

- Provide training materials and technical assistance to college/university preparation programs for social workers, teachers, nurses, health and mental health professionals, educational and public agency administrators, and other helping professions, and to their public school and community agency partners, so they may take advantage of emerging communications technologies.

- Review, and forge alliances with both national and local community-based efforts to broaden access to electronic networking technology.

- Promote inclusion of and partnership with persons and organizations outside of universities, both to develop--in the spirit of collaboration--stronger information resources and to increase access to these resources within and outside the university.

- Encourage university faculty to equip themselves with emerging electronic research and communications tools by demonstrating the uses and capabilities of the technology.

- Work with roughly twenty regional sites nationwide, identified in collaboration with the National Interprofessional Education and Training Network, to provide on-site needs assessment and technical assistance to establish vigorous participation in compiling program information and strategies and for distribution through the electronic network.

- Disseminate on a regional level technical assistance strategies for the development of technology infrastructure, drawing upon local and regional needs and assets, and employing national influence and information, especially the lessons of public policy in technology and communications.

- Establish links between local school/agency/community participants seeking electronic access, and regional/local efforts, discovered through national networks, to increase access (e.g., Computers for Social Change, Smart Valley).

- Assess emerging corporate and government efforts that aim to dramatically increase access to electronic communications technologies and articulate the implications of these initiatives for application to the project.

Advancing State and Regional Technical Assistance Networks for Collaborative Practice

Summary of Technical Assistance Component

We propose a national technical assistance strategy designed to advance collaborative practices in communities and higher education institutions. This is a five-year initiative that progressively phases in support for key people, organizations and regions. We emphasize that our work advances initiatives already underway in identifiable regions of the United States. In other words, we are not proposing to "seed" more pilot projects. Rather, we propose to build upon established initiatives launched by higher education institutions, schools, community agencies and neighborhood organizations. The major components of the technical assistance strategy are:

- **Launch a National Professional Development Academy that prepares cohorts of leaders to design and disseminate technical assistance about collaborative practices.**

- **Launch regional-local technical assistance networks in every region of the United States. These networks will advance collaborative practices in schools, community agencies and neighborhood organizations as well as IPET programs in colleges and universities.**

- **Evaluate the impacts of the National Academy, the regional-local technical assistance networks and the IPET programs.**

- **Disseminate knowledge and lessons learned through interaction with regional and local programs via the national and regional conferences, the electronic network, and appropriate publications.**

At the end of five years, we will have prepared five cohorts of technical assistance leaders, resulting in a national cadre of technical assistance leaders. We also will have developed with these leaders regional-local technical assistance networks in support of collaborative practices. When these leaders return to their respective networks, they will help others learn what they know. As knowledge, skills and strategies are shared, there will be two, related results: (1) new collaborative practices will be launched, or advanced, in schools, community agencies and neighborhood organizations; (2) interprofessional education and training (IPET) programs in colleges and universities that prepare future and present professionals for collaborative practices and technical assistance leadership will be advanced. In brief, we are proposing a sustainable strategy in which regional technical assistance networks in support of collaborative practices and interprofessional education become institutionalized.

Defining the Need for Appropriate Technical Assistance

As stated in the overview, there are growing calls in every service sector for new service delivery models, because existing ones are not working as intended. Outcomes for vulnerable children, youth and families and the conditions of their neighborhoods and communities are, in most instances, worsening. In other instances, there are few, if any improvements. There are many different models of service system reform. We are focusing on a model that stresses the role of line practitioners in determining the actual delivery of service, and therefore requires reformulating both preservice and inservice training to achieve a new service model. Universities and service providers all over the nation are struggling with the content and delivery of reformulated professional education which will prepare professionals for a different service model. An effective technical assistance strategy will ease this journey, bringing new participants the knowledge and experience of others who have worked on the problem for years, and allowing them to create their own solutions based upon solid information.

The need is not just to promote new training programs, but to promote training which encompasses the content necessary to achieve positive outcomes for children and families, based upon the latest research and evaluation of what works. We know that many families may have up to 14 service providers working with them without collaborating among one another or family members on the preferred service and or educational plan. Professionals therefore need to work together in new ways, to collaborate in coordinated service plans. However, in some cases interprofessional collaboration has inadvertently reinforced the distance between families and professionals. We also know that there will never be enough professionals to address the rising needs and challenges facing vulnerable children youth and families. A new balance between professional expertise and the decision-making power and authority enjoyed by families is therefore needed. In this new family-accountable model, improving outcomes is not the sole responsibility of professionals because all family members share responsibilities. This is model of shared accountability: professionals are accountable to families, and families are accountable to each other for improved outcomes.

Unfortunately, the majority of today's helping professionals (i.e., educators, social workers, health professionals, criminal justice specialists, and public administrators) have been schooled to believe in the professional-knows-best model. Moreover, the majority were schooled to work alone, not to collaborate with other professionals and families. In too many places, collaboration work practices have been sought without needed technical assistance and supports. In some cases, professionals have become so satisfied with the fact that they are collaborating that they neglect the crucial, next phase--namely, determining whether they have improved results for children, youth and families.

Thanks to pioneering work in schools, community agencies, neighborhood organizations, and higher education institutions, it is clear that professionals can "unlearn" past practices and learn new, **collaborative practices**, which are results-oriented and family-accountable. Interprofessional courses, experiences and programs are essential in this work. The time has arrived to build upon the achievements of these pioneering initiatives and advance collaborative

practices and interprofessional education through a national strategy to generate a growing capacity for appropriate technical assistance.

What are collaborative practices? By collaborative practices, we mean the process by which now-separate professionals and former clients (i.e., children, youth and families) work together in efforts to improve child, family and community outcomes. Getting professionals to collaborate with each other -- called interprofessional collaboration -- is a starting point, but not a final destination. Professionals also must learn new ways to collaborate with children, youth and families. Hence, we emphasize "collaborative practices, " not just "interprofessional collaboration." Integrating services for children and families is one example of collaborative practices. Other important examples are the provision of both appropriate supports (e.g., mutual aid and assistance networks for parents; legal assistance) and resources (e.g., discretionary income; stipends for program participation). There is growing evidence in support of the ways in which these collaborative practices improve outcomes for children, youth and families. Finding proven and readily accessible ways to improve these outcomes has become one of our nation's top priorities.

At the same time that collaborative practices are helping improve outcomes, there is widespread recognition of the need for appropriate technical assistance that helps professionals and family members alike learn how to do this work together. In addition, there are needed organizational and policy changes accompanying collaborative practices. What is technical assistance, and what do we have in mind when we use the term?

By **technical assistance**, we mean the transfer of appropriate knowledge, values, norms, sensitivities, skills and change strategies, which prepare individuals, groups and organizations to serve children, youth and families more effectively. Unfortunately, there is a documented shortage of qualified technical assistance leaders. To quote Charles Bruner (1993), a leading child and family policy advocate: "Currently, neither job descriptions for technical assistance providers nor credentials or professional training exist for those who do this work" (p. 5).

At the same time, we now know that collaborative practices vary considerably across the nation, and this variability complicates planning for technical assistance. Why is there so much variability? Two reasons come to mind immediately.

One reason is that collaborative practices must respond to local cultures, contexts, resources, needs and goals. Another is that collaborative practices are new and, absent needed technical assistance, local leaders have had to invent these practices. Confronted with this variability, we have concluded that the kind of technical assistance which offers narrow, standardized "one size fits all" skills training will not work. Rather, we need a more appropriate model of technical assistance, one tailored to what we know about collaborative practices in service of children, youth and families but responsive to the context of local needs.

Consistent with recent research on technical assistance and professional development, we propose a technical assistance strategy for collaborative practices that emphasizes **leadership development and localized capacity-building.** We identify later in this proposal essential

leadership components and strategies for localized capacity-building. Here we emphasize again that we are connecting technical assistance needs and strategies with interprofessional education and training (IPET) programs in colleges and universities. Why? Because we and others now understand all such collaboration involves creating opportunities, incentives and rewards for people to learn new ways to work together. Until we facilitate the learning and development of persons who work with children, youth and families, we cannot expect significant improvements in outcomes for children, youth and families, especially the most vulnerable ones.

We describe later in our proposal key components in preparation programs for technical assistance leaders. Some of these components are derived from a growing literature that began with Bruner's (1993) work. One essential component is relatively new, however, and so it is not well-described in the literature. This new component involves new family-professional partnerships. These new partnerships require new ways for professionals to think, talk, act and interact with families. New partnerships require professionals to share power and authority, listen to families, and stop assuming that "professionals know best" and families must comply with their orders. For families, these new partnerships bring new roles and responsibilities, including new paraprofessional jobs as child and family advocates.

Good things happen when professional-family and community partnerships are formed. This is especially so when families and communities are enfranchised as partners and share responsibilities for determining and implementing support strategies with both professionals and universities. We will call this approach to professional-family partnerships **family-accountable collaboration**, and although it is only one kind of collaboration, we will emphasize for technical assistance leaders its advantages and requirements. For example, these family-accountable partnerships help build trust and norms of reciprocity, and shared responsibility for outcomes. In short, these partnerships help build a sense of community and new capacities that remain in the community. In this sense, new professional-family partnerships are part of a sustainable improvement strategy for families and communities. We will therefore also stress the need for universities and service providers to engage in community building through non-hierarchical partnerships which include equitable sharing of power and decision-making.

Approach to Technical Assistance: Objectives and Operations

No national initiative can succeed without appropriate leadership. Our train-the-trainers approach will mobilize efforts to prepare a new generation of leaders who are able to provide technical assistance about collaborative practices.

The proposed National Professional Development Academy will prepare lead technical assistance facilitators. Knowing that individuals often change jobs and move from one place to another, we propose a national academy that will prepare regional **teams** comprised of professionals, community leaders and family members served by professionals. Sites will have the option of sending a second team to National Academy training in the second year of their participation, expanding the number of trained people at each location. Hence, if one individual moves to another location, the other members will be able to sustain the work. Moreover, these

teams will not only learn about collaboration at the National Academy; they will experience and model it daily. Team members also will learn how to help others in their regions learn about collaborative practices and technical assistance strategies in support of these practices.

After completing the Academy, these persons will return to their localities to staff and help advance regional technical assistance networks. We request in this proposal start-up funds in support of these regional technical assistance networks, including an evaluation of the impacts of these leaders and their networks.

Working in these technical assistance networks, teams of technical assistance leaders will undertake three related activities. They will:

- share with others what they have learned about technical assistance and collaborative practices;
- help develop and advance collaborative practices in schools, community agencies and neighborhood organizations; and
- help develop and advance IPET programs in colleges and universities, both undergraduate and graduate, both preservice and "in service."

In short, we are proposing a work plan that facilitates the simultaneous change of practice settings and preparation programs. We propose this plan for simultaneous change because of research evidence and past experience indicating that it is futile to try to change one (e.g., colleges and universities) unless we also change the others (e.g., schools, community agencies).

In our proposal, these leaders from the National Academy will be "on call" for follow-up assistance, networking and evaluation resources. The research on the implementation of innovations in all organizations highlights needs for such follow-up and -through assistance, which is readily accessible locally and regionally. In short, we have built into our proposal safeguards and procedures designed to maximize its impacts and warrant significant investments by funders. Above all, we have planned a strategy that will help sustain and institutionalize technical assistance capacities, collaborative practices and IPET programs in each region.

Objective 1: Launch a National Professional Development Academy that prepares cohorts of leaders to design and disseminate technical assistance about collaborative practices.

Operational Response:

- The National Professional Development Academy will be convened in June of each year. Sites will be selected each year from both the Western and the Eastern halves of the United States. Two separate sessions of the Academy will be conducted, one in the West and the other in the East. The exact locations will be determined after the sites are selected, to maximize access to the Academy and reduce travel costs associated with it.

- Prepare the following deliverables of the National Academy:
  1. Coherent staff development strategy and curriculum, responsive to the needs of facilitating teams and also advancing the family-accountable interprofessional strategy.
  2. Coherent instructional materials that can be used for replication and adaptation at the local, state and regional level.
  3. A minimum of four days of training and staff development and a minimum of two days for on site technical assistance for the facilitating teams, on an annual basis.
  4. Prototypes and protocols for staff and faculty development.
  5. Rapid deployment of instructional materials, workshop formats and course syllabi, degree program designs

Katharine Hooper-Briar and Hal Lawson at Miami University will serve as co-directors of this initiative and lead developers of the National Academy. This initiative will build on their work over the last three years, in which they have visited community collaborations and IPET programs in 32 states and provided technical assistance regarding collaborative practices to state agencies, schools, community agencies, neighborhood organizations.

Hooper-Briar and Lawson will recruit co-facilitators for the National Academy from the membership of the IPET Network steering committee and other organizations (e.g., Center for the Study of Social Policy, Harvard Family Research Center, UCLA Center for Mental Health in Schools). The facilitating team for the Academy will be culturally diverse. It will include family support and community organization leaders, university faculty, experts in school-linked services, policy analysts, and child-family advocates experienced in family-accountable, collaborative practices.

The team, working with others, will work to integrate now-separate course, workshop and program models. This facilitating team will inventory on an ongoing basis the most up to date, nationally recognized, technical assistance providers. It will feature, for example, the work of the National Commission on Leadership for Interprofessional Education, The Center for the Study of Social Policy (Frank Farrow), the Family Resource Coalition, the National Center for Family Based Practice, the National Council of Chief State School officers, the Georgia Academy, the Institute for Educational Leadership, The Iowa Family and Child studies Center (Charles Bruner), the Fordham School of Social Work-Education Collaboration Project, the University of Pennsylvania Reader's Digest/DeWitt Wallace WEPIC Initiative, The Harvard University Family Services Initiative, as well as those involving paraprofessional groups such as RAINMAKERS, Parents as Teachers, Family Development paraprofessionals from Hawaii, and leaders from the Parent Assembly (through the Family Resource Coalition).

We have provided, as Attachment 1, a first draft of the goals and suggested content for the National Academy. Participants competing the Academy will be prepared to give the same content and experiences to others in their respective, technical assistance networks. Moreover, much of this same content needs to be covered in IPET courses and programs.

A few knowledge and skill gaps remain because collaborative practices, especially family-accountable collaborative practices, are so new. While it is not yet possible to bridge every knowledge and skill gap -- because all of us are still learning about the challenges of family-accountable, collaborative practices -- the time has arrived to launch high impact change initiatives. Our evaluation strategy is designed to help address these gaps. By carefully and systematically evaluating these initiatives, our proposed work will provide needed knowledge, skill and understanding, which the Academy and the other dissemination networks can give to others. We propose building from strength, by advancing established initiatives, and documenting the lessons learned for others who will follow.

Objective 2: Launch regional-local technical assistance networks in every region of the United States, networks that will advance collaborative practices in schools, community agencies and neighborhood organizations as well as IPET programs in colleges and universities.

Operational Responses:

- Each year during the five year period we will assemble a team of technical assistance experts to plan and revise the content of the National Professional Development Academy sessions; and select the technical assistance sites for the coming year.

- Four sites will be selected as regional-local teams each year, based upon an RFP from the National Academy soliciting applications from known networks in each region. Each site will receive a two-year grant of $50,000 to launch their technical assistance networks and advance collaborative practices in communities and IPET programs in colleges and universities.

The funding for each site will be spread over two years, beginning with the year in which their teams complete the Academy. Sites will receive $50,000 to spend over two years to implement their plans. In addition, each site's evaluation team will receive $10,000 for the two years to support their assessment of the impacts of the work undertaken. Sites selected in years one and two will continue to participate after their funding ends. Sites will have the option of sending a second group to attend the National Academy in the second year of their grant, in order to deepen their capacity building for providing local technical assistance. The second year spending for the third cohort of regional-local sites will spend out in the fourth year of the project, but will be committed in year three. Hooper-Briar and Lawson will complete one follow-up visit each year, and site leaders will provide annual up-dates of new developments and lessons learned.

In the RFP, we will identify the overall national strategy, along with the requirements and expectations for each technical assistance network. Each applicant will need to document activities and achievements to date and plans for network clusters in their regions. Each applicant will also complete an inventory of the initiatives and related networks that exist already in their region, together with plans and support letters for collaborating with them. In addition,

each applicant will provide the following information: the team members who will attend the National Academy and lead the network; the members of an evaluation team which will assess the impacts of the work; the ways in which these two teams reflect the diversity of the community and represent families; five year goals, short-term objectives, and benchmarks; and procedures for charting and reporting their progress and achievements. Finally, each applicant will identify cost-sharing commitments, including joint sponsorship of team members attending the National Professional Development Academy.

- Selection criteria for the regional-local teams will include:

1. Demonstrable competence in consumer partnerships and interprofessional practice of each key technical assistance network member;
2. Demonstrated commitments to, and experience with collaborative practices and IPET;
3. Membership in regional and national networks through which innovations may be disseminated;
4. Matching commitments, including released time for staff and supports for family members;
5. Evidence of strong partnerships with local schools, health and human service agencies and community organizations attempting interprofessional collaboration and service integration initiatives;
6. Demonstrable capacity to enfranchise family members as guides and partners in building improved practices and outcomes;
7. Evidence of capabilities to effectively get and use data about improved outcomes and make "in flight corrections"
8. Capacity to promote in service and preservice development of front-line practitioners, including family members;
9. Willingness to assess, document, help organize and to build coherent linkages within the variety of interprofessional -consumer initiatives in the state or region.

Each site selected must demonstrate that:

1. There are at least three collaborative practice initiatives underway locally, and representatives from them are involved in the proposed technical assistance network,

2. They have already launched some IPET preservice courses and professional development initiatives,

3. Each site must commit to advancing at least three existing, collaborative initiatives and, within two years after its team completes the Academy, to launching at least three others,

4. Each site must demonstrate its commitment to expanding IPET courses and programs during the first two years.

New collaborative initiatives may be community-based, or in identifiable sectors of service delivery (schools, health or social service agencies). For example, a team may have a role in

spearheading three community collaborative strategies in their area, but find that one sector such as welfare or employment is not responsive to collaborative, family accountable practices. Bringing a particular state agency on board may require more within-sector or cross-sector collaboration. It might be found that both line level practitioners and CEOs are moving forward in collaboration, but that more effective strategies are required to engage middle managers in the collaborative process. In such cases, it will be the task of the regional-local team to stimulate and nurture the additional required collaboration.

Objective 3: Evaluate the impacts of the National Academy, the regional-local technical assistance networks and the IPET programs.

Operational Response:

- Each region will have an evaluation and impact assessment team, which must reflect the diversity of the community and model family-accountable, collaborative practices. These teams will do impact analyses, charting results, barriers and lessons learned.

- We will require that each team develop a participatory strategy for data-gathering, interpretation and use. We will provide each team with examples and choices.

For example, we will provide each team with a new approach called journey analysis. This is a user-friendly way to combine evaluation, research and action planning. Journey analyses can occur at several levels: (1) The technical assistance network and its leaders; (2) The community collaborations that are advanced and started; and (3) The IPET initiatives that are advanced and started. The information gained will be useful to regional sites. This information also will be incorporated immediately into the National Academy and disseminated electronically to others. Moreover, the evaluation strategy also will help leaders in future sites leap-frog over the barriers, dead ends and stuck points detected in previous sites. The evaluation will, in short, facilitate cross-site and -cohort learning and support networks.

Each team must chart progress toward improved outcomes for children, youth and families. Outcome-charting and outcomes-accountability make these collaborative initiatives strategic investments. In each initiative, team members will identify and address barriers in several delivery systems. In short, technical assistance, as we conceive it, is more than teams merely giving information to local collaboratives; it involve preparing all participants for outcomes-charting and outcomes-accountability.

Objective 4: Disseminate knowledge and lessons learned through national and regional conferences, the IPET electronic network, appropriate publications and presentations at professional conferences.

Operational Response:

- Utilize the national conference and electronic network components of the National IPET Network.

- The convenors of the national Academy will present our experiences and findings at appropriate conferences on national professional and service societies, and will encourage group presentations from the regional-local teams as well.

The proposed national technical assistance strategy in support of collaborative practices, especially family-accountable practices, is inseparable from the two other components of this proposal: the national conferences; and the electronic network. All the activities in this technical assistance strategy will build upon and reinforce the two other components of our national work. networks among front-line practitioners and parents. Our proposal models the kind of collaboration we are trying to promote.

At least twice each year, we will report new developments and lessons learned via the IPET electronic network. Technical assistance teams also will report their achievements, lessons learned and barriers via the electronic network and at conferences. Special attention will be given in these reports to new partnership models, the necessary conditions for making them work, and insights into how, under what conditions, when and why educational, health and social service systems as well as higher education departments, schools and colleges are able to re-structure and re-culture themselves. All National Academy participants, and all people the regional-local teams work with, will be given information about the conferences and the electronic network, and will be added to the network conference mailing list to receive updated information and invitations.

Summary of Technical Assistance Roles and Responsibilities

We recognize that our proposed technical assistance strategy is itself a collaboration involving complex change. Like other complex changes, in ours it may be difficult to envision from written text alone the roles, responsibilities and results of the participants. We provide below a capsule description of roles, responsibilities and results.

The Project Directors (Hooper-Briar and Lawson) will:

- Convene, coordinate the work of, and communicate regularly with, lead facilitators for the National Professional Development Academy;
- Convene, coordinate the work of, and communicate regularly with the National Steering Committee and the National IPET Network.

- Prepare technical assistance materials for the National Academy and regional networking sites.
- Conduct two follow-up site visits each year during the first two years; and one site visit per year in the third, fourth and fifth years of this initiative to help focus the evaluation and advance the technical assistance work underway for community collaboration and IPET programs in higher education;
- Help disseminate through electronic newsletters, presentations, and publications the activities underway and the results of the work.
- Oversee the budget and prepare annual reports to funders.

Regional Teams will:

- Offer to community members and university faculty, through their respective networks, the same opportunities for learning and development, which they received at the National Professional Development Academy;
- Help community leaders and university faculty to identify relevant outcomes for children, youth and families and develop joint capacities for charting outcome improvements that stem from collaborative practices and IPET programs.
- Provide, within two years after completing the Academy, technical assistance that helps advance at least three established, community-based collaboratives.
- Provide, within two years, technical assistance that helps launch at least three new, community-based collaboratives.
- Provide, within two years, technical assistance that helps advance IPET courses and programs.
- Evaluate the impacts and lessons learned from the technical assistance strategies.

Community Leaders and University Faculty will:

- Commit to long-term working relationships with leaders of the regional technical assistance networks.
- Commit to promoting and advancing collaborative practices, especially family-accountable practices, in their work.
- Collect information about the extent to which collaborative practices and IPET courses and programs, alone or in combination, improve outcomes for children, youth and families.
- Help lead, and participate in, participatory evaluations of the development of collaborative practices and IPET courses and programs.
- Help disseminate information and lessons learned that result from the evaluations.

Fiscal Agent and Co-Directors

Miami University of Ohio will serve as the fiscal agent for this component of the proposal. Miami university has an established commitment to collaborative practices. Through its Institute for Educational Renewal (IER), Miami is already extensively engaged in university-school-community-family partnerships, and it has launched IPET courses and professional development experiences. Miami is already providing, through Hooper-Briar, Lawson and others, regional

technical assistance in support of family-accountable, collaborative practices. IER is supported by several grant initiatives as well as from university budgets. Miami will also provide some support for a graduate student project assistant and for the work of Hooper-Briar and Lawson; these matching commitments are described in the attached budget narrative.

Katharine Hooper-Briar and Hal Lawson will serve as co-directors of this initiative and lead developers of the National Academy. They have provided technical assistance regarding collaborative practices to state departments, schools, community agencies, neighborhood organizations. They also have developed and implemented IPET preservice courses and professional development experiences and provided faculty development workshops in support of IPET. Their two monographs on collaborative practices and the roles of colleges and universities in supporting collaboration through IPET are in their second printing. Both are members of the National IPET Network, and both have membership in other national networks in social work, health and education.

Network Coordination and Conference Development

Summary, Network Coordination and Conference Planning

Direct personal interaction is a critical component of maintaining a vital movement for high quality interprofessional education and training. Assuring that this interaction occurs on a regular basis, in productive formats, and engages large numbers of diverse individuals and institutions requires a sustained investment of time and energy. We are therefore proposing two related sets of activities to foster this type on interaction: convening annual national conferences and facilitating the continued activities of the National IPET Network steering committee. Several network partners have joined together to assure that the national conferences will draw a wide range of professional and community participants, maintain close linkages with key actors and networks, and develop direct linkages with national professional and service sector associations. The key activities to make the conferences productive include:

- **Actively marketing to many types of potential IPET participants, utilizing the contacts of the network members**
- **Planning conference sessions by a committee composed of representatives from several participating networks, and drawing upon the requests for information identified by the electronic network and regional technical assistance activities.**
- **Devoting significant resources to drawing in both national associations and community networks as active participants. Providing stipends for community representatives and youth leaders to participate.**
- **Commissioning quality papers and presentations for conferences.**
- **Preparing and distributing detailed proceedings of conference discussions.**

The conferences are expected to be financially self-sustaining through fees, but grant funding is required for conference planning and coordination, and for preparation and distribution of in-depth proceedings.

The network has built considerable group identity and cohesion over the last year. We will nurture this cohesion as we move from the planning to the operations phase, continuing to have periodic two-day meetings. Since the steering committee is given specific roles in advising each of the three components, there will be a direct link between network policy and operations. Funding for community/practitioner representatives to attend, and for staff to provide timely minutes and follow through on decisions of the steering committee, will help assure its continued success.

Defining the Need for Conference Development and Proceedings

Universities which train human service professionals have been part of the problem of fragmentation in the human service delivery system, providing negative examples of faculty in isolated departments maintaining specialized streams of expertise and reinforcing specialization as a professional norm. Most universities have had minimal engagement with the communities they serve, rarely connecting on-campus learning to the experiences professionals will face when they practice in the community. Over the last five years, the field of universities attempting to develop a new, collaborative, community-based approach to professional education has grown from about a dozen institutions engaged in such training to about 50 programs currently identified. Early projects have begun compiling a record of experience about what does and does not work, while new programs are eager to learn from the pioneers without repeating their mistakes. However, there is currently no systematic gathering or exchange of information across the several "mini-networks" which have been created by different funders of such programs.

The members of these different networks came together last March at a national conference in Los Angeles, and decided to join together (see *Proceedings*, 1995). Over the last year, we have held several meetings and moved from a conglomeration of competing groups protecting our own interests to a truly collaborative enterprise, jointly redesigning projects and forging new partnerships to implement them, as represented in this joint proposal.

It has taken a substantial investment of resources to nurture this collaborative enterprise, and it will require continued investment to hold it together as we move from the planning phase to implementation, a transition which always puts stress on collaboration. Collaborative activities cannot be formed, nurtured, then neglected. We envision a dynamic movement, continually attracting new participants and responding to new challenges in the environment created by new research findings, practice trends and public policy changes. This section of the proposal discusses the resources which will be necessary to foster that dynamic development of the network.

In the first section we discussed the potential for exchange of information by means of an electronic network. In the second section we discussed the provision of technical assistance by means of regional-local teams, supported by a National Academy. In this section, we present the need for regular face to face conferences. These will both provide a location where individuals and institutions already engaged in IPET can come together, share experiences and assess the state of the art, picking up on new ideas and developments faster than can be achieved by waiting for publications. It will also provide an opportunity to draw in new participants, inspiring and informing them with the commitment and knowledge of those who have been working in the field for years. Further, it will provide that sense of community and mutual support necessary for the movement to succeed. Our commitment to include community and practitioner representatives in meaningful and full participation in all phases of our discussion carries through meeting and conference planning. We conceptualize this partnership to be enriched by the infusion of cultural democratic process and envision creating opportunities for a "third voice" to emerge.

We expect that as the movement becomes established and attracts adherents, it will become self-sustaining through membership fees and sale of publications and services. However, it will require several years of seed money to reach that stage.

A. National Network Annual Meeting, Conference and Proceedings

The network steering committee has decided to organize a flow of face-to-face meetings which will occur frequently enough to develop group identity and cohesion, while minimizing the cost of time and travel to meetings. We will fill in with telephone conferences and electronic communication. An important function of the meetings is to "provide a home for marginalized change-agents," who must simultaneously maintain an identity in their home professional while becoming part of the emerging interprofessional community. At this point in time, we must continue to function in two worlds: we must seek better opportunities for collaborative, interprofessional work to be accepted within each of our home professions; we must also have a structure which provides a nurturing environment and meeting place for our emerging group of collaborators.

Objectives 1 and 2:

1. **Recruit and retain a highly informed and energized cadre of individuals and institutions who are engaged in promoting interprofessional education and training as a major part of their ongoing activity in both universities and communities.**

2. **Provide an organizational locus for face-to-face information exchange among current and potential IPET participants. Promote in-depth discussion of experiences and challenges among IPET participants. Provide exposure to key IPET concepts and designs as inspiration to new or potential participants.**

Operational Responses:

- **Joint planning, convening and publishing proceedings of regional meetings, national conferences and inclusion in professional and community association meetings.** The UW Human Services Policy Center, the Center for the Collaboration for Children at CSU-Fullerton, and the USC School of Social Work will build upon their experience in running national conferences on interprofessional education and training in 1992 and 1995 to coordinate this work; UW/HSPC will take the lead and provide staff support.

- **We will actively promote conferences, seeking to enlarge the reach of the network.** Staff will track conferences of various other professional and community organizations and actively promote interprofessional presentations.

- **The National IPET Network will sponsor annual conferences, which will have two tracks.** One track will provide exposure about key concepts and ongoing efforts to new and

potential participants in IPET activities. A second track will allow experienced IPET participants to engage in deeper discussions of emerging knowledge and issues in the field. Both tracks will include commissioning high quality papers and facilitating the presentation of emerging results from evaluations of both service and training projects around the country. Participants and presenters will be encouraged attend in interdisciplinary teams.

Frequency and Scope of Meetings and Conferences:

An annual cycle of major national meetings interspersed with regional or topic meetings seems to provide a balance between sufficient frequency to develop relationships and a sense of group identity, and the need to minimize the cost of time and travel to attend meetings.

A. Local/regional and sub-network meetings ..... 1 day, several each year.
Potential audience to be reached..... 5 @100 - 400 participants = 1,500
These will be arranged by network members as part of their separately funded activities, and their funding is not included in this request. The coordination group will track and disseminate these conferences as scheduled.

B. Network Steering Committee Meetings ..... 2 days, three per year.
Persons to attend ..... 25-30, including network leaders, IPET program representatives, community/practitioner representatives, funders. Funding will be sought to cover travel costs for community/practitioner representatives, meals and meeting rooms. Network members and funders will pay their own travel and hotel costs.

C. National Network Meeting ..... 3 days, every year.
Potential audience to be reached..... 500+ in 1996-97.
All individuals who have been involved in local/regional meetings, or technical assistance activities will be included, as well as network leaders, IPET program representatives, community/practitioner representatives, comprehensive service and evaluation experts, funders. National conferences will be open to all interested individuals.

Funding for the regional-local meetings is not sought within this proposal, since it is a function of the various participating networks. We include it here to show how the structure of meetings adds up to a compete communication network. Our intent is that national conferences will become self-sustaining through fees. Most of the university and foundation players have funding for their own activities and participation in network activities. Additional funding is sought for several purposes:

- Commissioning high quality papers for keynote presentations.

- Stipends to allow community representatives, youth and professional students to participate in conferences; community representatives may include parents, consumers, community based organization (CBO) staff, community-based practitioners or para-professionals.

- Recording discussions, preparing and disseminating detailed proceedings.

- Actively promoting joint efforts with national professional and service associations.

- Planning large regional and national meetings requires professional staff time for which funding is not currently available; this up-front investment is necessary to make self-sustaining conference activities feasible.

Annual National Meeting Of All IPET Participants and Entrants

This will be designed as an all-inclusive conference, bringing together as many people operating or interested in IPET programs as possible, along with community and practitioner representatives, policy-makers, nationally recognized program experts, evaluators and private and public funders. We will draw on the broad range of contacts and mailing lists of the different participants who have convened conferences for their own networks. Drawing on these diverse groups will assure that many different professions, institutions and communities are well represented at conferences, providing the rich set of perspectives necessary to fulfill the broad objectives of this proposal, which entails setting a track for a major transformation of human service professions.

Conference programs will be designed to facilitate cross-network interaction and to assess the state of the art and future directions for the field. A *three day meeting* will allow a mixture of speakers/paper presentations, interactive sessions and informal networking and side-meetings. Within the three-day format, there will be an distinct track for experienced IPET program operators to meet for in-depth discussion to assess the state of the art and exchange information, evaluations and planning for new initiatives. Notification of the conference will be posted on the IPET network electronic clearinghouse, on other electronic bulletin boards such as Handsnet, as well as listed in professional publications and newsletters; it will also be publicized by the regional-local technical assistance teams and by the national associations who are members of the National Consortium for Interprofessional Education and Practice.

The network steering committee will decide the major topics ripe for consideration and suggest suitable locations. Locations will rotate around the country, and take advantage of the ability to visit interesting programs in conjunction with our conferences. Selection of topics will be enriched by analyzing the type of issues raised by queries to the electronic clearinghouse and to trainers for the technical assistance network. Discussions at regional meetings or gatherings of the participating networks will also inform the list of topics to be considered. This will not be a matter of chance; a major duty of staff working for each component of the network will be to track and summarize issues discussed and transmit them to the coordinating group for presentation to the steering committee.

The coordinating consortium will commission papers and panel presentations and plan the agenda. Additional funds may be sought from various foundations to pay for commissioned papers or other program enhancements.

The annual IPET conferences will have two tracks. Each conference will be designed to attract a broad range of individuals interested in developing collaborative community-based services, providing initial exposure, inspiration, information and contacts. There will be a combination of commissioned papers which document and discuss state of the art issues and interactive sessions where participants explore issues by trading expertise and discussing the issues they are struggling with. Within each meeting, we will have a track which will allow individuals and teams who have actually been operating IPET programs to compare their experiences and assess emerging trends at a deeper level.

Participants, both presenters and others, will be encouraged to attend as interdisciplinary groups. We will market the conferences in a manner designed to appeal to a variety of professions as well as community representatives. Professional student participation will be encouraged, since our primary objective is to influence the attitudes and knowledge of the coming generation of professionals.

A group composed of UW/HSPC, CSU/CCC and USC/Social Work received private foundation funding for two national invitational conferences on interprofessional education and training in 1991 and 1995. UW/HSPC has recently published extensive proceedings from the most recent conference. HSPC, CSU and USC will continue to organize national conferences, expanding them to be large annual events, and drawing upon an expanded planning group which includes the Interprofessional Commission of Ohio and the National Commission on Leadership in Interprofessional Education.

The conference planning group consists of :

Rick Brandon, University of Washington Human Services Policy Center; Chair.
Sid Gardner, California State University - Fullerton, Center for Collaboration for Children.
Jacquelyn McCroskey, University of Southern California, School of Social Work.
Michael Casto, Ohio State University, Interprofessional Commission of Ohio, National Consortium on Interprofessional Education and Practice.
Dean Corrigan, Texas A&M, Commission on Leadership in Interprofessional Education.
Yolande Trevino, Vaughan Family Center, at New Horizons Learning Center, Los Angeles.

Objective 3. Build Network Participation Through Regional / Local Network Meetings

Operational Response:

Regional meetings on collaborative services and training will be organized by the various participating networks. We expect several of these to occur each year. Participants could either be the members of one of the component networks funded by a single organization, or all people interested or involved in IPET activities in a particular state or region. All participants would be added to the electronic clearinghouse/resource list, and would be invited to participate in annual national meetings. All individuals and institutions involved in the work of the regional-local TA teams will be invited to participate in national conferences, thus linking them directly to the

national community engaged in IPET activities. No additional funds for this component are included in this proposal; we expect this to be an ongoing contribution from the participating networks.

The intent of the regional-local meetings will be to:

- inspire and inform new professional and community participants in the field of comprehensive, community-based, school-linked services.
- create opportunities to foster mutual learning from the field and create opportunities for indigenous leadership to participate
- share information, experience and expertise among people operating IPET projects
- provide local/regional focal points for interprofessional activities
- stimulate state and local systemic change toward more collaborative approaches.

Organizers of these meetings will see that announcements, agendas, background papers, proceedings and other forms of information would be captured and fed into both the national clearinghouse and the steering committee meetings. These regional-local network meetings will help network leaders identify topics and new participants for the biennial national meetings. The choice of topics, speakers and program format for the national conferences will draw upon the discussion at regional-local meetings, and will be designed to foster dialogue and mutual learning.

Objective 4. Engage (a) Professional Associations and (b) Community-based Organizations.

(a) Assure significant discussion of interprofessional issues at regular meetings of national professional societies and service associations, and participation of those associations in IPET conferences.

Professional societies for each discipline have a major impact in establishing the norms and expectations for professional practice and preparation. National associations of service agencies have a similar influence. We will therefore make a concerted effort to engage them in the movement toward collaborative, community-based practice. Several have already included service integration or collaborative practice in their national meeting agendas. However, there is a long way to go until this becomes a standard feature. In some cases, it may be profitable to stimulate "special interest groups" on interprofessional collaboration within large associations. The coordinating group will be responsible for planning and implementing a coordinated approach to getting IPET presentations and panels on the program of key professional association meetings. This will involve identifying key conference planning committees and seeking out sympathetic members to carry the message. We will also link closely to the networks in which community-based organizations share interests and issues, both to recruit their participation in IPET conferences and to raise the visibility of collaborative practice in those circles.

Operational Responses:

- The Interprofessional Commission of Ohio, which has been coordinating the National Consortium on Interprofessional Education and Practice, will share in funding from the group, with a particular function of promoting relationships with national professional associations.

We will both attempt to have IPET sessions added to national professional associations meetings and to have national associations participate in IPET conferences as active cosponsors.

- **Key activities will include:**

1. Convene a meeting of national association leadership -- elected presidents and executive directors -- to educate them about the IPET movement and about potential opportunities and requirements for their members and to discuss the implications of federal policies for effective interprofessional education and practice. The meeting will include leadership of both professional associations and community based organization associations.

2. Develop/maintain a master list of major professional and community organization conferences, including names of conference coordinators and program committee contacts.

3. Circulate information to IPET network members.

4. Solicit people from IPET network to present papers, organizes panels. The network would be used to solicit a broad range of panelists and paper presenters, and report back on reactions to presentations.

5. Solicit participation in IPET conferences by representatives of community-based organizations interested in collaborative services and training of new types of workers.

6. Work with program committees for association meetings to arranged featured role for IPET topics; use network members and association contacts to identify receptive members of program committees.

7. Create opportunities for meaningful dialogue between the leadership of national professional associations and the leadership of associations representing indigenous leaders and emerging youth leaders, with the intent to infuse the experts/professionals in embracing creative innovative solutions to community problems in a way which will shift the current expert/professional paradigm to create win/win solutions.

Maintaining contact with such large and diverse numbers of individuals and institutions will require two full time professional staff. One, located at Vaughan Family Center, will be responsible for tracking networks of community-based organizations and individuals. The other, located at UW/HSPC will be responsible for linkages with national organizations in consultation with the Interprofessional Commission of Ohio, as well as for carrying out the other coordination and conference planning functions for the National IPET Network.

The Interprofessional Commission of Ohio and National Consortium will facilitate a gathering of national association leadership -- the current elected presidents and executives of the national professional associations and national educational associations -- to give this effort its

initial momentum. This would be a 2-3 hour lunch meeting held in DC. The program could consist of a presentation by representatives of the National IPET Network Steering Committee from universities, funders and community/practitioner groups. We will explore whether it is best to include associations of community based organizations in this meeting, or whether to convene a parallel meeting of those leaders.

The intent would be to inform the leadership about:

- the current status of interprofessional education and practice, and
- issues related to IPET that affect their membership, such as increased opportunities and requirements for interprofessional practice for the professional associations and additional standards and curricular shifts for the education associations,
- policy matters at the federal level that impact IPET, such as demonstration project requirements for collaborative practice, interdepartmental initiatives like "Together We Can," and research funding initiatives like those in OERI.

Objective 4. Engage Professional Associations and Community-based Organizations.

(b) Assure that networks of community-based organizations and individuals are included in the national discussion, including active participation in IPET conferences, and utilize their energy and creativity as catalysts for change in large institutions.

Operational Response:

- Yolande Trevino of Vaughan Family Center will be funded to join the group with the specific function of developing linkages between IPET network conferences and community based organizations and facilitating the participation of local community and emerging youth leadership in interprofessional education and practice.

- We have included funding to pay for community representatives, youth leaders and professional students to attend steering committee meetings and conferences.

Objective 5. Capture the ideas and information exchanged at meetings/conferences and return it to the field in useful summaries and proceedings.

Operational Response:

- *UW/HSPC will continue to prepare conference proceedings and disseminate them nationally in both written form and through the IPET electronic network operated by NCSWEC.*

This will be a major activity, since we think it is important to provide a more timely compilation of key writing and discussion of topics than can be found in published literature. The

discussion among participants at such conferences is often more useful than the prepared papers, and we will emphasize interactive sessions. To allow us to capture these discussions, conference budgets will include funds for graduate students and CBO staff to serve as note-takers and prepare summaries of conference sessions, which will serve as the raw materials for conference proceedings. Substantial faculty and graduate assistant time will be devoted to careful analysis of the discussions and preparation of useful proceedings. In addition to providing timely information to individuals and institutions operating IPET programs, such proceedings will allow the network steering committee and other interested parties to regularly track the progress of the field.

Additional Funding is Requested For:

- conference coordination, recording/note-taking
- travel costs for community/practitioner participants, and a limited number of IPET project representatives lacking funds to participate
- stipends for professional students and youth leaders to participate
- production of written proceedings: compilation, writing, printing and distribution.
- commissioned papers
- travel costs of nationally recognized experts

Conference Fees will be Charged to Cover:

- conference facilities and supplies
- meals

Roles and Responsibilities of Conference Development Partners

We have outlined an ambitious agenda to enlist thousands of individuals and institutions in a national movement. Providing the infrastructure for that movement will require significant financial resources. Our intent is to distribute financial and staffing resources across the different groups participating in the network. The coordination group at UW/HSPC will be responsible for coordinating staff of those different enterprises and inculcating a sense of group identity as network players.

The UW Human Services Policy Center [HSPC] is coordinating a consortium of organizations which have been involved in developing conferences and related forums. These include the Center For Collaboration For Children at CSU-Fullerton, the USC School of Social Work, the Interprofessional Commission of Ohio, the Vaughan Street Center in Los Angeles, and the National Commission on Leadership in Interprofessional Education. Over the last year, HSPC has organized and facilitated the steering committee work of the of the National IPET Network. During this process we have forged new partnerships which will enable us to carry out this ambitious agenda. This proposal therefore includes funding for three different entities carrying out complementary activities, with HSPC serving as overall coordinator and fiscal agent:

- HSPC will have the lead role for facilitating Network activities, capturing the conversation in working memos and conference proceedings, and convening the working group for conference planning.

- The Interprofessional Commission of Ohio, which coordinates the National Consortium on Interprofessional Education and Practice, will take the lead to enlist the participation of national professional and services associations.

- The Vaughan Family Center will take the lead to link IPET activities to the national networks of community-based organizations, and recruit and prepare emerging youth leaders to participate in IPET conferences.

- CSU/CCC, USC/Social Work and the National Commission on Leadership in Interprofessional Education will serve on the conference planning committee, contribute to the agenda and facilitate organizational contacts and participation.

B. National Network Steering Committee Coordination

Objectives:

1. Facilitate the continued development of the national network and its steering committee as a collaborative enterprise, through periodic group meetings, written interchange and coordination of staff located at different institutions.

2. Assure that all members of the network and steering committee have access to timely information about activities of member networks and relevant professional society and service association efforts. Keep in touch with other related and emerging networks and facilitate joint efforts with the National IPET Network.

3. Capture the creative discussions among members and feed them back in a timely manner through minutes and other publications.

4. Identify trends and changes in the practice and policy environments which affect the growth of interprofessional practice and professional preparation.

Operational Responses:

- **Ongoing coordination and facilitation of the National Network, convening of steering committee meetings and monitoring of the network's achievements and challenges by UW/HSPC.**

UW/HSPC has been coordinating the activities of the steering committee, including securing funding, arranging and facilitating meetings, preparing timely summaries of steering committee decisions and discussions and keeping members informed of activities. HSPC will

continue to perform these functions, and will build on existing organizational capacity to expand these activities in several ways.

The movement will require a recognized hub, not to control the multiplicity of efforts, but to assure that all members are kept informed and to stimulate growth of the network. We place high value on collaboration among equal partners from universities, service agencies and communities services, and have built new partnerships into all our proposals. We will continue to operate as a network, rather than creating a new organization.

The movement will be held together in the operational phase by coordinating a staff group across the different operating entities, and involving that staff group in steering committee meetings so that they develop identity and allegiance to the Network as well as to the group by whom they are directly employed.

HSPC will invest substantial leadership time from the Director, and hire professional staff to meet the needs of an expanding national effort. Staff will track activities of network members and related organizations around the country, and distribute written and electronic materials which keep members informed of developments. A key function will be to gather information from the electronic clearinghouse requests and discussions, and from the TA/training activities to inform the steering committee and conference planning group about issues of interest and interesting innovations and experiments.

The steering committee coordination effort will include maintaining ties with current and potential funders to assure that the financial needs of a growing national effort can be met.

- **Convene regular steering committee meetings at different locations around the country; assure that representatives of all sectors -- universities, community representatives, funders -- stay actively engaged and participate on an equal footing.**

We have found that our steering committee, a core group of 25-30 people playing lead roles in various networks, has had to meet for two days, several times a year, in order to develop sufficient group cohesion and to plan the range of activities necessary. This proposal represents the product of meetings and consultation over the last year, and represents the top priority activities identified by the group. Regular meetings will be required in coming years both to provide the coordination and linkage described among the various components, and to undertake the additional activities described.

The steering group includes network leaders, community/practitioner representatives, comprehensive service and evaluation experts, private foundation and governmental funders. In this forum we have developed joint proposals for the major network activities listed above. These meetings provide in-depth discussion about what we are learning within our respective networks, and allow us to assess the environment and potential directions of the IPET movement and catch up on events. This group will discuss potential topics and speakers for the annual all-inclusive

meetings. We have found that two day meetings are required to allow in-depth discussion and enough informal interaction to foster group understanding and cohesion.

Agenda setting will become more complex as we move from planning to operations. The steering committee is designated to serve a variety of functions in the different components of this package, from advising on the content of National Academy sessions and the selection of sites, to deciding major themes and topics for the national conferences. It will therefore be necessary to stay in close touch with the different teams to determine what items are ripe for discussion, make sure that preparatory materials are sent to members in advance of meetings, and see that necessary decisions are made on time to allow projects to proceed apace.

We have also started a practice of visiting exemplary programs at each meeting to keep our discussions grounded in the realities of practice. These meeting swill move around the country, combining discussions with site visits to innovative programs in various states. It may be possible to piggyback this meeting with that of major association conferences, but it will be necessary to avoid having the meeting dominated by members of one profession who would be attending that conference. We will explore mechanisms to maximize community inclusion in steering committee discussion and explore utilizing community locations for steering committee meetings.

The UW/HSPC will continue to be responsible for preparing the agenda in consultation with the steering committee, securing a meeting place, facilitating the meetings and preparing and distributing a summary of discussion and conclusions.

Funders are asked to pay for:

- meeting coordination and communication [planning and dissemination of results]
- meals on site
- travel costs for community/practitioner participants [5-7]

The various participating networks will attempt to build the travel costs of participating in this core group into their basic budgets. We will attempt to have network participants host the meeting to avoid the costs of a meeting facility.

Resources Required for Coordination

UW/HSPC will continue to take operational responsibility for coordinating IPET steering committee activity and the annual conferences, and arranging funding for including community, practitioner and youth representatives in meetings and conferences.

HSPC costs for coordination, production of proceedings and dissemination will be about $202,000 per year, most of which will be to cover the costs of staff and of identifying community/practitioner representatives and paying for their travel to meetings. The remainder will be to develop agendas, working notes after steering committee meetings, and proceedings from annual conferences. Funding is requested for overall network coordination and steering committee meetings; costs of annual conferences will be developed each year and funding sought

from other sources. The Interprofessional Commission of Ohio and National Consortium on Interprofessional Education and Practice will require $37,000 for their role in coordinating and attending meetings and facilitating national association involvement. The Vaughan Family Center will require $57,000 for tracking and engaging community-based organizations and youth leadership in the network.

Staff functions:

Maintaining adequate communication among the members of a national network and successfully organizing national conferences requires at lease one full time staff. Since we have decided we want to function as a network, rather than create a new national association, we have just one full time staff at the central coordination unit, designated Network Coordinator, and have other staff functioning at network partners.

The Network Coordinator, located at HSPC will be responsible for keeping the staff at the different participating groups aware of their dual identity and their role in a national effort. The primary duties of the Network Coordinator will include: maintaining communication flow among network members and staff; planning and organizing annual conferences and steering committee meetings; preparing conference proceedings; developing relationships with national professional associations [in consultation with Interprofessional Commission of Ohio]; overseeing budgets and preparing reports to funders.

The Community Organization Coordinator, located at Vaughan Family Center, will be responsible for developing linkages and facilitating communication with national and regional networks of CBOs. This will include assuring their adequate participation in planning and attending annual IPET conferences, as facilitating IPET presentations at their regional and national meetings. The Network Coordinator and Community Organization Coordinator will clearly have to work closely together to produce a coherent effort.

References

Crowson, Robert L. and William Lowe Boyd, "Coordinated Services for Children: Designing Arks for Storms and Seas Unknown." *American Journal of Education* 101 (February 1993)

Harasim, L., Hiltz, S.R., Teles, L, and Turoff, M. (1995). Learning networks: A field guide to *teaching and learning on-line*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kahn, Alfred J. and Sheila B. Kammerman, "Integrating Services Integration: An Overview of Initiatives, Issues and Possibilities." September, 1992.

Melaville, Atelia I. and Martin J. Blank, *Together We Can: A Guide for Crafting a Profamily System of Education and Human Services.* U.S. Dept. of Education and U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services, April, 1993.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1995). 1995 Survey of Advanced Telecommunications in US Public Schools, K-12. Washington, DC: Author.

Schorr, Lisbeth and Daniel Schorr, *Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage*. New York: Anchor Press, 1988.

US Department of Health and Human Services. (January 1991). Service integration: A twenty-year retrospective. Washington, DC: Author.

M.C. Wang, G.D. Haertel, and H.J. Walberg, "The Effectiveness of Collaborative School-Linked Services." National Center on Education in the Inner Cities, Temple University, Philadelphia, 1993.

Attachments

1. **Qualifications and Capacity of Lead Participants**

2. **The National Professional Development Academy: A Draft of Proposed Goals, Format and Content**

3. **Proceedings, National Conference on Interprofessional Education and Training, Los Angeles, March, 1995. Separate Document.**

Attachment 1: Capacity to Carry Out Project - Background of Partners

University of Washington Human Services Policy Center (HSPC)

The mission of HSPC is to improve the well-being of children and families by promoting collaborative and preventive approaches to service across the bounds of professions, disciplines and service organizations. HSPC conducts policy analysis, training, technical assistance and public communication to promote this mission. Core funding is provided by the Stuart Foundations; other local and national foundations support various HSPC initiatives.

UW/HSPC is a recognized leader in the field of interprofessional education and training, operating one of the flagship IPET projects which has been featured in national publications such as *Together We Can*, published by the US Depts. of Education and Health and Human Services. The Training for Interprofessional Collaboration [TIC] project has written articles and book chapters, made presentations at several major professional conferences, and is in process of writing a book and publishing a learning Resource Guide for collaborative education. HSPC has also co-organized two major national conferences on IPET, in 1992 and 1995, and published proceedings. HSPC took the impetus to bring together the different mini-networks and has been facilitating the activities of the network steering committee. Since HSPC is organized as a joint effort of six professional schools at the University of Washington (the Graduate School of Public Affairs, the College of Education and the Schools of Public Health and Community Medicine, Nursing and Communications), we are modeling internally what we are promoting externally. HSPC has a governing council appointed by the deans of the six schools, and all of our projects have interdisciplinary faculty teams. Major HSPC projects are:

- *Washington Kids Count*, whose mission is to improve policies for children by analyzing data on the well-being of children, disseminating them in highly accessible formats, and stimulating communities to develop local action agendas. Each year we publish the *State of Washington's Children*, plus 42 individual *WKC County/City Profiles*, and *KidsFacts*. WKC is a joint effort of the schools of Public Affairs and Public Health and Community Medicine, in partnership with the Children's Alliance. WKC has developed a network of local media and human service contacts, which allow us to link public communications efforts to direct service programs.

- *Training for Interprofessional Collaboration* has developed a program to train health professionals, teachers, social workers and administrators to function as collaborative teams, through a mixture of campus-based and site-based instruction. TIC is a joint project of UW's Schools of Education, Nursing, Public Affairs, Public Health and Social Work.

- *The Collaborators' Network* facilitates communication among practitioners and policy makers who are developing integrated service approaches. Our regular conferences are attended by a diverse set of practitioners and policy makers. Under the auspices of the Family Policy Council, *HSPC provides technical assistance and training to the state's local Public Health and Safety Networks*, , which are charged with developing comprehensive plans to reconfigure human services to achieve measurable outcomes for children and youth.

- *HSPC has conducted evaluations* of such diverse projects as family violence intervention, food stamp outreach and cross cultural health care under contract to state and local government agencies. Our evaluation of the state's food stamp outreach program, which combined organizational process analysis with statistical outcome analysis is considered the leading model in the field, has been published in journals, and is regularly referred to by federal officials providing guidance to other programs. We have performed special analyses of issues including childcare, work and welfare, teen pregnancy prevention and the impact of media coverage on child protective services.

- *Child Health Initiative*. HSPC houses the national program office for the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's child health initiative, which is funding local efforts to provide comprehensive child health services in communities around the country. We assist the projects in getting started, monitor their progress, and arrange for technical assistance.

Interprofessional Commission of Ohio and
National Consortium on Interprofessional Education and Practice

Both organizations are based at the Ohio State University and are recognized for pioneering and continuing leadership in the development of interprofessional education and practice.

Founded in 1973, the education and training program of the *Interprofessional Commission of Ohio* may be the longest continual program of its kind in the country. It is a collaborative program of over 15 Colleges and Departments of the University as well as the 3 independent theological schools in the Columbus area. The Commission has developed a curriculum of 9 pre-service graduate and professional courses to provide future practitioners with the skills and values necessary for effective interprofessional practice. In conjunction with its 8 member state professional associations (allied health professions, education, law, medicine, nursing, psychology, social work, and theology), the Commission has developed over 40 state conferences to provide continuing interprofessional development for practitioners. Currently, the Commission is developing and refining its curricular and professional development activities in conjunction with its role as the human service consultants for a comprehensive redevelopment of the university area neighborhoods in Columbus. The Commission has developed numerous journal articles, books and conference proceedings over the years, including most recently a collaboratively written textbook, *Interprofessional Care and Collaborative Practice*. Recent Commission projects in addition to its on-going courses and research include its OSU-based Campus Collaborative for Educational Excellence, its state-wide community education network *Education Improvement: A Training Model for Community Involvement, the Quality Childhood Collaborative of Columbus and Franklin County*, annual state-wide conferences on bio-medical ethics and aging issues, and technical assistance to communities and institutions.

The National Consortium on Interprofessional Education and Practice is a collaborative of 16 national professional and educational associations from the allied health professions, education, law, medicine, nursing, psychology, social work, and theology that was founded in 1985 at the initiation of the Interprofessional Commission of Ohio. It has assisted in the development of awareness, knowledge and programs in interprofessional education and practice among and within the national associations. Proceedings of its 3 national conferences have been published and circulated widely. The National Consortium has also brought together the national executives and elected Presidents of its member associations for exploration and discussion of developments in interprofessional education and practice.

Vaughan Family Center: A Model for Change

The Vaughan Family Center (VFC) is a model of what a neighborhood center can and should be. It is located on the campus of a nationally known charter school (Vaughan Next Century Learning Center), but is funded and operated as an independent entity. The center was started by a partnership of the Los Angeles Education Partnership (LAEP), and United Way, and has been funded by a number of foundations, including the Stuart Foundation, the James Irvine Foundation, and the Wellness Foundation. The center has grown beyond its original goals, and has evolved into a powerful neighborhood center.

The original goal of the center was to integrate services to families of children attending the school to help overcome non-educational barriers to education. It is well known that non-educational barriers to education (inadequate health care, effect of dysfunctional families, etc.) far exceed the educational barriers. Also, services to the poor are highly fragmented and a given family in need seldom has all its needs addressed. The consequence is that the non-educational barriers continue to plague many families living in poverty, and education has not been able to break the cycle of poverty because of these barriers.

Vaughan was founded as a partnership with local health and human service organizations, e.g. Friends of the Family, El Nido, Olive View Hospital, Northeast Health Services, etc. These organizations work with case managers and family advocates at the center to help families overcome a variety of problems that make it difficult for their children to learn effectively at the school. The center has been remarkably effective and teachers and parents alike attribute a significant portion of the success of the charter school to the family center.

The center is guided by a commission consisting of representatives from the services, teachers, and most important, the parents. The parents are very active participants and were instrumental in selecting its Executive Director, Yolande Trevino. It is under the guidance of Yolande Trevino that the center has become a national focus of attention of how an impoverished community can empower itself and start to break the cycle of poverty.

Despite its accomplishments as the source of integrated services to the families of children at the school, it is the center's role in the neighborhood that has attracted national attention. Under the guidance of Yolande Trevino, the center is unleashing the human capital in the neighborhood. by helping families with multitude of problems recognize their own worth, reinstilling hope, taking proactive steps to improve themselves and their neighborhood, and not waiting for or relying on government or others to do it for them. It is because of this spirit of self determination and power that the center is evolving into the lead of Pacoima Urban Village movement. The Pacoima Urban Village is the focus of a socio-economic development strategy that will eventually lead the village to financial independence and self sufficiency.

The center's emergence as the lead in a socio-economic development strategy was not foreseen and is threatening to some. The power and passion associated with unleashing the human capital shows tremendous potential as a way to break the cycle of poverty without excessive cost because it taps the power inherent within the impoverished community. However, it is threatening

to some members of established institutions dealing with the impoverished because they can't control the process and it threatens established relationships.

In some respects, the Vaughan Family Center is similar to a growing number of school-based and/or neighborhood centers. It works with the school to use the case-management approach to address children's problems noted by teachers. It works with local providers to ensure that the affected families' total needs are addressed, and not just the surface needs. This integrated approach is proving to be cost effective and beneficial to the school as well as the families. The benefit to the families also helps establish trust and credibility of the center. It is what the center does with this trust and credibility that makes it especially effective as a neighborhood center and a model for breaking the cycle of poverty.

The center uses the trust and credibility to help the parents and families see their true worth, re-establish hope for the future, and commit to building for the future with their children. As parents recognize their own worth and start exploring what they can do, their enthusiasm and growth encourage others to discard the mantle of oppression and commit to improving their socio-economic condition. The Vaughan Family Center has ample evidence of the power and passion associated with unleashing the human capital. This is reflected by a neighborhood of people with high hopes, tremendous amount of camaraderie and mutual respect, parents acting as equal partners in the center, families committed to breaking the cycle of poverty themselves and not waiting for others, gang members choosing a more productive life and businesses wanting to work with the center.

The center, along with the Pacoima Urban Village, is a partner in a newly formed national association known as Americans for Better Communities (ABC). Banana Kelly, a highly successful organization in the South Bronx, is the lead organizer for ABC, and is an example of how an impoverished community can break the cycle of poverty by tapping its own strength. Banana Kelly chose to partner with Vaughan because of its common interest and success in unleashing the human capital in an impoverished community, and mutual recognition of the tremendous potential for impoverished neighborhoods as well as for the country with this approach.

The National Center for Social Work and Education Collaboration

The National Center for Social Work and Education Collaboration promotes systemic school reform that embraces the social context of children's lives. Founded and administered by Fordham University, the Center comprises a national network of universities working with local public schools to support at-risk children and families. The Center's mission is based on the premise that providing carefully integrated school-linked social services is a critical, but still overlooked component in the movement to improve our schools.

The participating universities' schools of education and social work collaborate, both with each other and with their communities' schools, to train education and social work students to work together. The National Center was established with a three-year, $2.4 million grant from the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund. More than $1 million of the $2.4 million grant goes directly to the regional sites to support their programs. At the school level, social work interns provide social services to children and their families. Programs operate in schools where a large proportion--often the majority--of students are members of ethnic minorities who live in economically disadvantaged communities. Participating universities place in these schools student teachers and social work interns who work together closely, incorporating the lessons of collaboration into their approach to the classroom and the lives of children. Supportive administrators, teachers, and community agency staff work with the projects. University research and training resources are deployed to enhance the likelihood of success.

At the university level, the Center seeks to change the two professions over time through the development of new curricula and model interdisciplinary partnerships. The objective is to achieve a long-term impact on the professionals who educate children and who provide helping services to children and families in the nation's public schools. Each partnership--of the public school, and social work and education institutions--also expects to disseminate results and to play a leadership role at the regional level.

The National Center, which was established in 1993, is developing a clearinghouse on social work and education collaboration in the public schools. Various communications efforts are underway to serve the Center's regional projects and collaborative school reform efforts nationwide. A print newsletter currently reaches all schools of social work and teacher training programs. A biweekly e-mail bulletin was initiated and distributed to the regional projects. Each project is evaluated by a local evaluator, and the national effort as a whole is evaluated by a staff research director and independent evaluation consultants. Findings are used to shape programs as they develop, and are electronically disseminated nationally to provide lessons learned to the growing movement for integrated services and collaborative programs.

Affiliated universities include: Boston College; California State University, Long Beach; Clark Atlanta University; Eastern Washington University; Fordham University; Howard University; University of Houston; University of Utah; Washington University; Wayne State University.

University of Miami, Ohio, Institute for Educational Renewal

Miami University is a publicly-assisted university. Miami's main campus is in Oxford, Ohio, and there are two regional campuses in the mid-size industrial cities of Hamilton and Middletown. 16,000 undergraduate and graduate students are enrolled on the Oxford campus; about 4,000 students are enrolled on the two regional campuses. Miami has an established record of advancing school and community initiatives in local rural communities, small towns, and the nearby cities of Cincinnati and Dayton.

In 1990, Miami University launched its Institute for Educational Renewal (IER) with support from the Danforth Foundation, The Martha Holden Jennings Foundation, and the National Network for Educational Renewal under the directorship of John Goodlad. Collaborative practices and interprofessional education are central to IER. Here is a brief description of IER:

MISSION of IER

To renew the capacity of schools, families, health and social service agencies and Miami University to exercise shared responsibility for the learning, development and well-being of all children, youth and families.

The Institute for Educational Renewal is a network of partnerships that is being shaped by schools, social service agencies and Miami University. Families and professionals associated with these schools and health/human service agencies are connecting with the network in order to learn how to improve the conditions surrounding the education, development and well being of their children and youth. For Miami University faculty and students, the network creates opportunities for them to learn from, and contribute to, the work that member schools, agencies and families are doing.

Learning how to respond better to the complex, interdependent needs of children, particularly as these are nested within family and community contexts, requires shared goals and collaborative action. Network partnerships define their agendas in relation to their communities' aspirations and needs and five inter-related goals :

- Improve education, health and social services for children, youth and families.
- Improve the education of future educators and health and human service professionals.
- Support the development and renewal of individuals -- university, school, health and agency personnel, and families.
- Support the development and renewal of organizations, including inter-organizational relationships.
- Support inquiry for improvement and renewal -- assessment, critique, evaluation and research.

Working and learning together in pursuit of these goals involves ongoing self-examination, reflection and change, a process that we call "simultaneous renewal."

Attachment 2

The National Professional Development Academy: A Draft of Proposed Goals, Format and Content

I: Goals and Key Questions for Participants

Goal 1: To provide for participants a concrete conception of collaborative practices and IPET.

- Key questions: What is collaborative practice, and how would planners try to change and unify systems in support? How would you know it if you saw it? What policy supports are needed? What are the necessary conditions, starting points and progress indicators?

Goal 2: To provide participants with concrete conceptions and examples of collaborative practices, emphasizing family-accountable practices.

- Key questions: What new approaches improve results for children and youth? What role(s) do children, youth and families have? How do health and social services change? How do schools change? What changes are required in special education and student support services? How can we integrate all of these changes into initiatives for child welfare, health promotion and public health, family support and preservation, and school reform?

Goal 3: To provide participants with implementation strategies for collaborative practices and IPET programs.

- Key questions: How do we align state, regional and local policies and practices? Do we initiate change from the top-down, bottom-up, or both? How can we help others gain understanding and ownership of needed changes and the change process? In what ways can a technical assistance network help others learn about collaborative practices and IPET? What IPET course and program models provide useful starting points for planning? What other components are needed in professional development and preservice programs?

Goal 4: To identify with participants likely change facilitators and barriers, along with barrier-busting strategies.

- What are the predictable barriers to collaborative practices in communities? To IPET programs in colleges and universities? How can these barriers be removed, or minimized? How can barriers become short-term objectives for change? What are some of the facilitators for change in communities, colleges and universities? How can progress and results be evaluated? In what ways can the information be used?

Goal 5: To develop among participants a consultative and mutual support network.

- What linking strategies are used to develop networks? How can they be maintained?

II: Proposed Process and Progression for Each National Academy Session

Process

Participants need to identify their own change goals and work from them, building from their understanding of their respective work and policy contexts. Participants also need to hear about what is working in school communities across the nation. At the same time, participants need opportunities to share with each other predictable "stuck points," barrier-busting strategies and necessary conditions for systems unification and change in support of collaborative practices and IPET programs.

In short, we propose a format that accommodates adult learning needs and styles as well as encourages dialogue, collaborative problem-solving and solution-seeking. We propose to provide technical assistance materials, many in the form of "overheads" that participants can take home and use in their own work setting to help others learn what they have learned.

Progression

1. Identification and clarification of teams' action goals in relation to the national agenda.

- Indices of vulnerability and crisis among vulnerable children, youth and families; data trends, costs of failure and rotten outcomes (Bruner, Schorr)
- Child and family policies and legislation encouraging or requiring collaborative practices.
- Needs for a focus upon improved results (outcomes) for children, youth and families; legal and moral imperatives for outcomes-based accountability structures.
- Outcomes-identification and charting strategies: Implications for learning structures and organizations.

2. Developing school-family-community partnerships; evidence in support of collaborative practices and new partnership models.

- An overview of best principles and practices; a continuum of collaborative practices that includes prevention, early intervention and crisis-oriented strategies.
- Findings from major child welfare research centers (e.g, Chapin Hall) and reviews of findings from family preservation efforts, community based child welfare and family supports, and foundation initiatives from Casey, Pew, Kellogg, Danforth, etc.
- Focusing upon children and youth while supporting families and engaging in community development: Ways to re-frame children's issues as family support and community development challenges.

- Family support and family-accountable practices as centerpieces of a preventive strategy.
- Mobilizing community based service models in creating more effective intervention and relapse prevention programs
- Community collaboration and service integration: Challenges and limits of current efforts

3. Restructuring and reculturing schools, community agencies and state departments in support of collaborative policies and practices that advance systems unification and change. These elements will be highlighted:

- The importance of culturally-responsive practices, integrating services and providing "wrap-around" collaborative case planning with children, youth and families;
- Former clients as partners: Family-accountable, collaborative practices.
- Family members as paraprofessionals: The preparation and roles of child-family advocates from communities;
- The necessity to prepare local, site-based change facilitators; on-site technical assistance experts as facilitators for collaborative practices; overall needs for follow-up and follow-through assistance to help people learn and institutionalize new roles.
- Needs and responsive strategies for technical assistance related to collaborative work practices, technical assistance that is tailored for the roles of front-line practitioners (e.g., health and child welfare practitioners, classroom teachers, special education teachers and supervisors, school social workers and nurses), middle managers (e.g., principals, health and social service supervisors), and chief executive officers (e.g., superintendents, heads of health and social service agencies);
- Needs for enabling policies, incentive grants and one-time-only venture capital for local communities in support of collaborative practices and IPET;
- Factors that make for successful collaboration: Norms for collaboration, shared outcomes, missions, resources and accountability for results;
- Toward schools, community agencies and state departments as learning organizations: Procedures for inclusion, role release and redefinition; shared accountability criteria and structures; data-based decision-making criteria and structures; participatory-action approaches to evaluation;
- Strategies for evaluating progress indicators and impacts; using the data for continuous corrections and setting short-term objectives.

5. Building IPET courses and programs in colleges and universities, along with interprofessional higher education-community partnerships.

- A rationale for the simultaneous renewal of higher education, schools and community agencies; a second generation partnership model for collaborative practices and IPET.
- Partnership issues: How to think simultaneously about education, research and service outcomes; how to mobilize faculty and change the missions of the program to build public policy and practice agendas and partnerships; how to engage other relevant faculty and professions; new models for academically based service learning; new models for faculty work roles and rewards, along with departmental organization.
- Course examples and program models for undergraduate and graduate preservice education
- Models for IPET professional development programs.
- Strategies for evaluating progress indicators and impacts; using the data for continuous corrections and setting short-term objectives.

6. Concrete action steps and necessary conditions for change. Identification of lessons learned, barriers, barrier-busting strategies, and facilitators.

- Challenges in setting up demonstration projects-definitional, operational, experimental control-comparison issues
- Mapping of the critical points of intervention; alternative models that guide these interventions
- Finance Models: Use of new funding streams; blended funding strategies; budget neutral expenditure shifts
- The challenges and opportunities posed by block grants.
- Evaluating barrier-busting and change strategies: The importance of lessons learned for other initiatives.